DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 079 24 FL 001 743

AUTHOR	Ulibarri, Horacio, Ed.
TITLE	Interpretive Studies on Bilingual Education. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	New Mexico Univ., Albuquerque. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0609
PUB DATE	Mar 70
CONTRACT	OEC-0-080-609-4531(010)
NOTE	99p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education, Bilingual Schools, Bilingual Students, Conference Reports, Cultural Pluralism, Culture Contact, Educational Policy, English (Second Language), *Folk Culture, *Inservice Education, Language Instruction, Mass Media, Modern Languages, Multilingualism, Non English Speaking, Second Language Learning, *Sociocultural Patterns, Sociolinguistics, *Speeches

ABSTRACT

This final report contains speeches on bilingualism given at conferences in San Antonio, Los Angeles, and Albuquerque. "Bilingualism and Socioculture", "Community Involvement Through Effective Use of Mass Media Communication", "In-Service Training", "Folklore", "Dialectic Education", and "What's the Score on Bilingual Education?" are reprinted in this work. A series of on-going, public school projects in bilingual education are examined individually. The history of the entire project is reviewed and abstracts provided for four monographs concerning project-funding and function, a compendium on bilingual education, administrator guidelines, and a collection of ideas and materials on bilingual education drawn from various sources. Pre- and post-questionnaires, evaluations of conferences, and a concluding statement are included. For a related document see FL 001 740. (RL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BR 8-0609
PA 24
FL

ED038079

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8-0609
Grant No. HEW-OEC-0-080-609-4531 (010)

INTERPRETIVE STUDIES ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Horacio Ulibarri
University of New Mexico
College of Education
University Hill, N.E.
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

March 1970

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

FL 001 743

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

ED038079

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT 1

ABSTRACT OF PUBLICATIONS 5

SAN ANTONIO CONFERENCE 12

LOS ANGELES (MONTE CORONA) CONFERENCE. 50

ALBUQUERQUE (ARIZONA-NEW MEXICO) CONFERENCE. 64

EVALUATIONS OF CONFERENCE 83

PRE-POST QUESTIONNAIRE 89

CONCLUDING STATEMENT 96

SECTION I

HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

The project was originally funded from June 26, 1968, for a period of nine months or until March 31, 1969. Subsequently an extension of the grant was made to extend from March 26, 1969, to January 30, 1970. The first part of the project was concerned with reviewing the literature on bilingual education and compiling it into some useable form for public school administrators and teachers. The second phase of the project, March 1969 to March 1970, was primarily concerned with the dissemination of this type of information.

The initial activity of the report was to compile a bibliography and to review the literature in the area of bilingual education. From July through the middle of September 1969, six graduate students, who had been trained in abstracting literature, were busy reviewing literature on bilingualism and bilingual education. During this period, approximately 2,000 pieces of literature were reviewed. Abstracts were made of all of these studies and catalogued according to a taxonomy that had been developed for this purpose. From the middle of September through November, two graduate assistants and four part time readers were retained on the readers' staff to finish reading the selected bibliography, and to refine the abstracts made during the previous period.

At this time, writing of the review of the literature commenced. The taxonomy that was originally intended for the compilation of the literature was revised to more suitable form for practical application by teachers and administrators. It was soon discovered that the literature in the area of bilingual education had been produced through research that came about by idiosyncrasies and personal interests of investigators. Most of the research was of a survey type, and very little was of an experimental basis. Also regarding the total scope of bilingual education, very large gaps were found in the literature where no survey or experimentation had been made. Sometimes the studies reported were very inadequate from a research point of view. For example, several studies were longitudinal studies of one individual made by the interested father.

It was decided to compile the monograph that would consist of four parts. The first part presents the review of the literature according to the revised taxonomy. The second part of the monograph would be a treatise on implication of the literature for bilingual education. For this purpose, the project went beyond the mere review of the literature. The project director and some of his staff had been working in the area of bilingual-bicultural education for some time and they supplemented the literature where it was "spotty" with personal experience and observations in order to make it a meaningful whole to the teachers and administrators.

Always fearful of extreme subjectivism, the monograph was submitted to a sociologist who is particularly interested in the bilingual

Mexican-American, to an anthropologist who has done extensive work with Navajos and with Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest, and to other educators who have had extensive experience in the education of Mexican-Americans. This was done for the purpose of rendering judgement on the suitability of implications for education. These comments were received and incorporated into revisions made on the implications for education.

The third part of the monograph consisted of approximately two hundred annotated entries which had been made from the literature. Of the two thousand and more pieces of literature that were reviewed, all had to be discarded either because of faulty research design or because of irrelevancy to the area of bilingual education.

The fourth part of the monograph consisted of entries that had some relevance, however far fetched it might have been to bilingual education, for the purpose of supplying readers or perhaps other investigators who would like to develop a bibliography on some aspect of bilingualism.

This monograph was submitted as an interim report at the end of the first phase of the project. Mistakenly, it was titled Interpretative Studies on Bilingual Education: A Final Report.

Noting the dearth of useable research for teachers and administrators in the area of bilingual education, it was decided to develop two other monographs. One monograph was dedicated to the teacher in the area of bilingual education. The monograph was entitled What Teachers Should Know About Bilingual Education, written by Miles Zintz. This monograph crystallized the notions on bilingual education that were of particular concern to the teachers. This monograph was a product of the literature that was reviewed, as well as extensive background of bilingual-bicultural education that Miles Zintz has developed through his years in New Mexico. A third monograph was developed, titled Administration of Bilingual Education, which was an attempt to develop amongst the administrators a background knowledge of bilingual education concepts to enable them to administer bilingual education more adequately. This monograph was written by Horacio Ulibarri and edited by Richard Holemon, and again, it fused the literature with the extensive experience and background of the writers in order to make the monograph a meaningful guideline for the administrators in the field. These two monographs were all submitted as interim reports. All three monographs subsequently were accepted by the Office of Education, and permission was given for distribution.

In writing the monographs, it became overwhelmingly evident that more than the available written literature needed to be had for the development of useable, adequate guidelines for bilingual educators. Thus, the project started negotiations for an extension of the grant with the U. S. Office of Education Research Dissemination Branch well before the termination date of the grant. The purpose of the extension of the grant was twofold. The first one was to hold a conference where

"experts" in the field of bilingual-bicultural education would be congregated for the purposes of exchanging ideas in the area of bilingual education. Given the literature available and their extensive background, it was preported that in small group situations, because of synergic factors, worthwhile ideas not contained in the literature would be generated, which if later incorporated into guidelines and infused with the literature would provide a bridge for the gap that exists between research and practice in the field of bilingual education. At least, these guidelines would present a base from which bilingual education projects would be launched and sustained for some period of time until more research information was obtained.

When word was received that the grant had been extended, the plans were finalized to hold such a conference in Albuquerque. At this conference there were approximately 65 participants from the ranks of teachers, administrators, supervisors, and college personnel. This information was gathered and subsequently summarized during this conference. The dynamics of this conference have been reported in an interim report, and a summary of the information gathered during this conference was also reported as an interim report, November 1969. A summary of the ideas gained at this conference is contained in Appendix A.

From September to December, 1969, the crystallization of ideas gleaned from the literature and synthesized from the conference held in May was compiled into a monograph, entitled Bilingual Education, A Handbook for Educators, which is being submitted as part of the final report of this project. The monograph was given to 25 teachers and administrators of the Albuquerque Bilingual Education Project, sponsored by ESEA Title VII. The purpose of having these teachers review the monograph was for the purpose of "testing" it in the field as to readability, to usability by practicing administrators, and for possible inclusion of other concepts in revision of the contents contained therein. The 25 teachers and administrators who reviewed the monograph received it with a surprisingly overwhelming enthusiasm. There was much praise for the monograph as to its readability, the content, and applicability to bilingual education. Comments were made that something like this was sorely needed and would have helped them had they had it since the inception of their project. At the same time, there was more objective criticism made of the monograph by these teachers through a form that was provided them for this purpose. (See Appendix B) There were suggestions made as to changes and inclusions needed. These suggestions were incorporated within the general context of the monograph, the intent of the monograph, and projection to its uses in the Southwest.

During the months of December through February, the last phases of the project were carried out. In negotiating for an extension of the grant in the Spring of 1969, with HEW, the proposal stipulated that an information dissemination conference be held during the month of November, in Albuquerque. At this conference, educators from on-going projects including administrators and teachers from the states of Texas, California, New Mexico, and Arizona would be invited to participate in

this dissemination conference. Considering the expense of transportation which, outside of getting a person from one place to another, has no output in terms of information gained or disseminated, it was proposed to the supervising officer that instead of bringing the people from the several states to Albuquerque, that the staff would go to the several states and hold three separate conferences at the same cost that one could be held in Albuquerque. This procedure would capitalize the use of other resources, both within the ranks of practicing educators as well as some college personnel in the area. In this manner, a greater number of educators would be contacted than if attempts were made to bring them all to Albuquerque. This permission was granted, and the plans to hold these conferences were finalized.

For greater input, the project decided to hold these conferences with the cooperation of the state education agencies. The state education agencies in Texas, California, New Mexico, and Arizona were contacted, and since there is an extreme shortage for state wide in-service training, the state education agencies were extremely pleased to be able to cooperate with the project in holding these conferences. Thus, the state education agencies were charged with finding facilities, inviting the participants, and contacting some of the consultants. The project personnel would provide literature for the participants as well as consultant help. There was great cooperation on the part of the state education agencies, and this had an unanticipated consequence of developing a stronger tie between institutions of higher learning and state departments of education.

A conference was held in San Antonio, another one at Los Angeles, and a third one at Albuquerque during the months of December and February, respectively. A fuller report of these conferences is contained in the following sections.

Organization of the remainder of the report

Section II of the report contains an abstract of the monographs that were produced during the course of this project. Section III contains a detailed report of the San Antonio conference, the Los Angeles conference, and the Albuquerque conference. Section IV of the report contains concluding remarks and recommendations.

SECTION II

ABSTRACT OF PUBLICATIONS

During the course of the project, four monographs were developed. The first one was a summary of the funding and their interpretation in relation to education. The second publication was a compendium on bilingual education directed at the teachers. The third publication was a monograph giving guidelines to educational administrators on the nature of bilingual education and how to direct bilingual education programs. The fourth monograph was a crystallization of ideas on bilingual education gleaned from the review of the literature, a conference of bilingual educators, and observations and experience of the authors. The target audience was teachers, project directors, curriculum coordinators and other administrators.

The following are the abstracts of these monographs.

Interpretative Studies on Bilingual Education

Final Report

The first phase of the Bilingual Research Project entailed an examination of the literature and current school practice regarding objectives, growth and development, language acquisition programs, evaluation, teacher personnel, and educational and research implications. The Southwest Spanish and Indian peoples were our target populations. Complete details are available in the Final Report.

Objectives for Bilingual Education

A variety of objectives were ascertained; among them were:

A. To teach the child proficiency in reading, writing, and speaking English.
B. To teach the child the majority culture.
C. To teach the child the majority culture and his own culture.
D. To teach the child how his own culture varies, contrasts and agrees with that of the majority culture.
E. To strengthen the child's self concepts.
F. To draw a child and his home into the educational process.

Growth and Development

Compared to the majority culture peers, the "other cultured" child starts out in school low and consistently loses ground throughout the school years. This is characteristic in measures of intelligence, academic growth, self concept, and participation in the dominant culture. Physical factors (diet, surroundings) undoubtedly play a significant role in this deterioration. The typical school fails to support the

bilingual child either affectively or cognitively.

Language Acquisition and Learning

Research and practice have generally failed to keep abreast of the newer concepts in language acquisition. It seems that a feeling pervades the field that once the bilingual learns the new language, his other problems will be solved. There is a persistent trend for teaching the sound system (phonemes) followed by the words (morphemes) and finally a grasp of the new language. Recent developments in socio-linguistics, language and cognition, and multilingual analyses suggest that emphasis should be placed on developing rules for going from underlying representations to surface phonetic shape. A wealth of linguistic findings has yet to be applied to the everyday work of the classroom teacher.

Programs and Methodology

Most curricular offerings for bilingual children show very few differences from any other curricular offering, that is, programs in the Southwest could be interchanged with those from the Northwest, Northeast or any place else, and one would scarcely note the difference. In many cases, school systems that were moving in new directions appeared to view the bilingual effort as peripheral to the central concern of the school, that is, certain programs were offered during a small part of the day for a small part of the pupils. Among promising innovations that were unearthed were:

A. Teaching a content like science first in English, then in Spanish. Significant gains were made by the minority group pupils in language acquisition in both languages.
B. Cultural heritage being used as a central focus for curriculum development.
C. Certain pupils are taught to read in both Spanish and English. In some cases, gains have been noted for the Spanish-speaking child.
D. Multi-media approaches seem to hold promise, that is field trips, models, mock-ups and other laboratory-type experiences.

Tests and Measurements

Far too much of the work in tests and measurements seems aimed at discovering the obvious, namely, that bilingual children fair poorly with typical tests. "Culture-fair" tests have failed to eliminate these differences. Such difficulties are accentuated when comparisons are made on national norms, rather than on local, indigenous norms. A basic difficulty seems to be that intelligence or predictive tests for the bilingual child have not yet uncovered those learning tasks from his own culture which will effectively predict success in learning the other culture. The mere translating of tests from English to Spanish is not likely to improve the situation, since the concepts come from the Anglo culture, rather than from the Spanish culture. What is needed is either a school program geared to teaching the bilingual as he

is, or a planned, systematic effort to provide the bilingual with the learning tools requisite for the school situation.

Implications for Education

The review and analysis of practice and theory in bilingual education encourages us to advance the following recommendations for educational practice:

A. The child's native language should be used as an instructional tool. We are not clear how this should be applied, in what subjects, and for how much of the school day.
B. Advantages accrue when the teacher is bilingual.
C. Program planners should include psycholinguistic and emotional factors.
D. Consideration of the bilingual's sociocultural values is important.
E. Learning objectives should be stated in behavioral terms.
F. The program should make the bilingual child aware of the dysfunctional cultural forces which may create imbalances.
G. The positive elements from the bilingual's culture must be reinforced.
H. A systematic public relations program should help legitimatize the school's function; it should help bring the parents into the school.

Implications for Research

The reader might gain the impression from examining the foregoing points that certain areas were stated in general terms. He may have noted a lack of precision. The problem is that all too often research is absent or incomplete on matters critical to the educational process for the bilingual child. Attention is called to certain areas:

A. The mental, emotional, social, and physical growth of the bilingual child as he enters school and progresses through school need to be studied in depth and detail. Something on the nature of Havighurst's developmental tasks is needed for such pupils.
B. The degree to which cultural differences interfere with learning should be studied.
C. What teacher characteristics are associated with successful teaching and learning for the bilingual child?
D. Teaching methodology; team teaching, grouping, individualized instruction, concrete vs. abstract learning--these need to be studied for their effectiveness in the bilingual program.
E. What kinds of evaluation methods are most appropriate for the bilingual-bicultural child. For example, we need to develop effective methods for evaluating the child's ability to speak English.
F. Appropriate evaluation instruments for the bilingual must be developed.

G. Approaches to community awareness must be cultivated so that easy two-way communication is established with the schools.

A corollary of this question has to do with the effective utilization of community resources, particularly its human resources, in the educational process.

Included in the report is an annotated bibliography of some 200 entries, plus a selected bibliography of more than 900 entries. All of these notations refer to some phase or aspect of bilingual education.

Miles V. Zintz, What Classroom Teachers Should Know About Bilingual Education, March 1969, deals specifically with the teacher and bilingual education. The first chapter, "Cross-Cultural Education" gives the reader insight into the cultural and linguistic differences between the Indian, Spanish, and Eskimo children. Zintz points out the "child whose cultural heritage is different from the school culture is in need of special educational services that will bridge the cultural barriers and meet his language needs before he can take advantage of the course of study with which he is apt to be confronted." He also points to the interference factor cultural mores, habits, values, and characteristic pose in language acquisition. In conclusion of this opening chapter, Zintz states that teachers must continually be alert to the linguistic and cultural differences of these different groups. "Most important is the realization that one way of life or one language for communication is not better, nor superior, and not 'more right' than another."

"Problems in Second Language Learning" are studied in Chapter II. The author cautions his readers to discuss English linguistics only in the context of the cultural values, practices, attitudes, and ideals that are expressed through language. Linguistic principles that impinge directly on the work of the classroom teacher are (1) Language is oral, (2) Language is habit, (3) Language is arbitrary, (4) Language is personal, (5) Language is more than words, and (6) Language is culturally transmitted. A comparison between factors involved in English as a Second Language as opposed to English as a First Language clearly points out the difference between these two approaches. The components of language and a contrastive analysis of Spanish and English are included in this chapter.

A description of TESOL (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages) is discussed in Chapter III, "Classroom Methodology." "The basic principle," states Zintz, "is the learner acquires the ability to use the language communication skills of English in order of listening, speaking, reading, and writing." The importance of the teacher's awareness of learning principles and strategies is stressed here also. The last pages of the third chapter are a series of models used in substitution for oral practice, expansion, transfromation, and past, present, and future tense useage.

"Without first mastering the sound system of the language, the student gets hopelessly lost, and if he stays in school his achievement level drops further and further below that of his English-speaking counterparts." In the fourth chapter, "Special Aspects of Vocabulary," the reader is exposed to the research done in idiom testing, multiple meaning tests, and simple analogy in respect to the performance by bilinguals on such tests. There are many lessons which can be devised for developing aspects of vocabulary. Such techniques are using elementary stories and poems, finding matched pairs, clothing we wear, and association of opposites. Finally, the various readers such as the Miami Linguistic Reading Series and the Bank Sheet Readers are discussed.

The fifth and final chapter, "The Bilingual School," deals with the major objectives of the bilingual program. Such objectives as "the learner's achievement and aspiration levels will be raised through the program," and "the learner's self concept will be constantly considered by the school," are examples of the type of objectives one might consider in a bilingual setting. "A bilingual school is one in which instruction during the school day is afforded in more than one language." Included also in this chapter are titles of Spanish texts and selected bilingual readings for classroom teachers.

An appendix for each chapter that includes readings and references concludes this text.

Horacio Ulibarri and Richard Holemon, Administration of Bilingual Education, March 1969. The text deals with goals, the bilingual education program, the teacher and bilingual education, materials, methodology, testing and funding potential for bilingual-bicultural education programs from an administrator's viewpoint.

Under the section headed "Goals," the authors point out that "to be productive, the purpose of bilingual education, like other goals of education, must be stated in terms of desired behavioral out comes." These goals must be stated for the areas of language skills, knowledge and concept, application and use of knowledge and concepts, development and reinforcement of attitudes, and social funtionality.

In administering the bilingual education program, program developers and the teachers of bilingual education programs have a clear field in which to develop and implement programs using the research available and the best theories that can be mustered. "It is necessary for the program developers to have a very clear understanding of the culture and the bilingual-bicultural child so that fallacious assumtions are not made." In conclusion, "bilingual and bicultural education should open the door, broadening the horizons of the bilingual child, and enhancing a more integrated development of his personality."

The teacher and bilingual education refers to the specific,

specialized knowledge that a teacher brings with him to the bilingual classroom. "A stable personality, a cheerful attitude, and a deep understanding of children are all desired qualities in a bilingual-bicultural teacher."

The materials available to the bilingual-bicultural teacher usually represent translations from English originals. In utilizing bilingual program materials, caution in using these direct translations from English should be exercised. "Curriculum developers, administrators, and teachers should take a careful look at the materials in which they intent to invest their monies."

Methodology in a bilingual-bicultural program "must be tempered with a tolerance for student beliefs and concept." The socio-cultural orientation of the child, his understanding of his role in the two societies, and the individuals' needs and aspirations must be considered.

The administration faces serious problems when he attempts to measure the aptitude and achievement of bilingual children. "Because of the lack of validity due to cultural variations, achievement tests pose severe limitations when used for diagnostic purposes."

Bilingual-bicultural education programs will need, in most cases a multi-funding approach. There are monies available through the Local Education Agency, State Education Agency, Title VII, ESEA, Title II, ESEA, Title III, ESEA, and Title VIII ESEA. Other funding potentials are the Adult Basic Education Programs, Educational Laboratories, and the National Teacher Corps.

Horacio Ulibarri, Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educator, November 1969. This monograph focuses on the objectives of the bilingual education program, the program itself, the teacher and bilingual education, materials, and evaluation in bilingual education. The second part, "Implementing the Program," relates to initiating and implementing the bilingual education program. The major steps are (1) Conceptualization of ideas for change, (2) Community summary, (3) Determining the type of program, (4) Setting objectives and first definition of the program, (5) Piloting, (6) Implementation, and (7) Evaluation. Section III is a very complete annotated bibliography dealing with all areas of bilingual education.

The scope of this monograph is directed toward the classroom teacher and reflects the philosophy that there are many different methods, approaches, and techniques that may successfully be used in a bilingual program. To illustrate this philosophy more clearly, some specific topics under each section will be treated.

Consideration of the socio-cultural background, social class, economic standing of parents, acculturation, language skills, knowledge and concepts and their application, development and reinforcement of attitude, social functionality, relation of immediate, intermediate, and ultimate

goals, types of programs, professional preparation, teacher behavior, materials, and affective goal and concept development are treated carefully in the first section of the text. The reader is able to grasp quite clearly the importance of each of these topics in relation to bilingual education.

Implementing the program deals with the need for community surveys, data collection focused on a specific problem, the necessity of a frame of reference that represents a workable frame work, relationship of socio-cultural data to the total program, analyses of the various components relating to the program, diagnosis of needs, objective, and selection of materials. This final section (materials) provides an excellent listing of materials in both the Spanish and English languages geared especially toward teaching of specific subjects (math, science, language arts and the like). The concluding section of Part II relates to selection of personnel, in-service education, program evaluation, and a public relations program.

All of the areas covered in this final publication represent those topics of interest and value to the educator.

SAN ANTONIO CONFERENCE

Mr. Juan Solis, of the Texas Education Agency, was instrumental in the development of the procedures of the conference held in San Antonio, Texas, December 11-13, 1969. The format of this conference was as follows:

Thursday, December 11
Afternoon

REGISTRATION
Receipt of Symposium Materials and Arrangement of Project Displays

PROJECT DIRECTORS AND ADMINISTRATORS
Educational Program Evaluation and Independent Accomplishment Audit
Dr. Albar Peña, Director, Bilingual Education Program Branch, USOE and Mr. Richard Goulet, Program Manager, Bilingual Education Program Branch, USOE

Selection of Panel Members

Friday, December 12
Morning

REGISTRATION

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Dr. Severo Gómez, Assistant Commissioner of Education, Office of International and Bilingual Education

Introduction of Guests and Introductory Remarks

WELCOME
Dr. Albar Pena, Director, Bilingual Education Program Branch, USOE

SOCIO-CULTURE AND BILINGUALISM
Dr. Horacio Ulibarrí, Director, Bilingual Research Project, University of New Mexico

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT THROUGH THE EFFECTIVE USE OF MASS MEDIA COMMUNICATION
Mr. Mike Cantú, Education Service Center, Region XX

GROUP SESSION "A"

Group Tasks
#1 - Interpersonal Reaction to The Preceding Presentations in Accordance With Assigned Points of View

#2 - Implications for Successful Project Operation
#3 - Preparation of Group Report

Afternoon

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Post Meeting Feedback - Presentation of Group Reports
Outline of Group Report to be Filed with Symposium Chairman

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION
"Administrators, Teachers and Teacher-Aides"
Mr. Victor Cruz-Aedo, Consultant, Instructional Services,
Office of International and Bilingual Education

GROUPS SESSION "B"

Group Tasks
#1 - Interpersonal Reaction to The Preceding Presentations in Accordance With Assigned Points of View
#2 - Implications for Successful Project Operation
#3 - Preparation of Group Report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Post Meeting Feedback - Presentation of Group Reports
Outline of Group Report to be Filed with Symposium Chairman

A PANEL DISCUSSION OF CURRENT PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS AND PLANNING FOR CONTINUATION
Mr. Josué Gonzáles, San Antonio ISD

EVENING FUNCTION

Presentacion Folklorica

Saturday, December 13
Morning

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Summary of Previous Day's Work
Orientation to Current Day's Work
Announcements

DIALECTIC EDUCATION
Dr. Rudolph Troike, Associate Professor of English, The University of Texas

GROUP SESSION "C"

Group Tasks

#1 - Interpersonal Reaction to the Preceding Presentations
In accordance With Assigned Points of View
#2 - Implications for Successful Project Operation
#3 - Preparation of Group Report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Post Meeting Feedback - Presentation of Group Reports
Outline of Group Report to be Filed with Symposium Chairman

Afternoon

RECAPITULATION OF SYMPOSIUM ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION

Speech delivered by Dr. Horacio Ulibarri at
San Antonio, Texas, Monte Corona, California,
and Albuquerque, New Mexico

BILINGUALISM AND SOCIOCULTURE

Bilingualism and functionality in two sociocultures are directly related. Generally the level of functionality of the individual in either socioculture determines his level of proficiency in either language. The fact that parents of a given sociocultural background often are more fluent in their native language than English presents some confusion to the educators. They tend to think that the children are also more proficient in their native dialect than in English. This is not necessarily the case. When one examines the language proficiency of children of minority groups to whom English supposedly is a second language, proficiency in their native language is generally lower than in English, even though their development in either language may be severely retarded. For example, in New Mexico the native Spanish-speaking New Mexican invariably is more proficient in English than in Spanish. Their level of proficiency in English will depend on the educational attainment levels of their parents as well as their socioeconomic status, both factors of acculturation. The same fact was found generally throughout the Southwest.

The concepts of bilingualism and biculturism are often mistakenly interchanged. This perhaps is due to the fact that large minority groups in the United States who are bilingual also have a culture that is different from the regular Anglo-American culture. For example, in the Southwest all the bilingual people speak Spanish or an Indian dialect. These native speakers come from a cultural background different from the Anglo-American culture. Hence, in the Southwest, bilingualism always connotes biculturism. Little thought is given to the fact that often minority group members, even though bilingual, may not be bicultural. Rather many of these people are typically marginal persons groping aimlessly and accepting what comes fortuitiously from either culture. Even though interrelated and interdependent, bilingualism and biculturism are two distinct phenomena. Biculturism refers to the cultural elements which may include language, but go beyond language. Biculturism is a functional awareness and participation in two contracting sociocultures (statuses, roles, values). For the sake of greater clarity, it must be stated that it is possible to attain biculturism without bilingualism and bilingualism can be achieved without dual acculturation.

When the philosophies, emotions, and aspirations of a socioculture are learned both at the conceptual and cathetic level that is when an individual becomes a bicultural individual. Perhaps the assumption here is that true bilingualism is better attained when the individual becomes bicultural. Finally, one must differentiate amongst bilinguals

between those who acquire a second language by the way of leisure time activity as opposed to acquisition predetermined by survival motivations in learning a second language. This second group refers specifically to the minority groups in the United States who have a different sociocultural, and have had to acculturate and learn English as their second language.

In the early days of investigating the bilingual child, it was found that the bilingual child tended to be inferior in most variables, e.g., intelligence and academic achievement, when compared to the English-speaking child. These discrepancies in favor of the English-speaking child were generally explained in terms of language differences. Minority group members as a whole have less accessability to: 1) the economic base of the nation, 2) the social life of the American people, and 3) the educational opportunities of the schools. Because of the base-line conflicts, minority group members, e.g., the Indians and the Mexican-Americans, are relegated a lower status, and are destined to poorer conditions and standards of living than the majority group members. This poverty springs the downward spiral of poor education, poor health, less energy, less functionality within the Anglo-American culture, and thus more destitution. As a result one finds today most minority group members are impoverished and with rather low educational attainment levels. What has to be considered, however, is the generally poverty stricken conditions that characterize the minority groups --including bilingual minorities. Regarding physical growth, health, and sickness, there has been no widespread research that has attempted to assess the physical status of the bilingual minority group member, especially as it applies to bilingual education. In recent studies strong evidence exists that mental growth is arrested and affected by dietary and nutritional deficiencies during pregnancy period and especially during the first six months of life of the infant. This means that it is possible to have generation after generation of impoverished slow learners among these groups.

The literature is in general agreement that when intelligence tests are applied to bilingual groups, the scores obtained are much lower than the scores of the norm group. It has been found that when non-language or performance types of tests are administered, the results are more favorable. The research literature is in concensus that the bilingual child generally achieves at a lower level and gains at a slower rate than the Anglo-American English-speaking child in all areas of the curriculum when the instruction is done in English. When the instruction is done bilingually, there is a definite gain in language acquisition in both languages by the bilingual. In one study, the bilingual students showed less gain in subject matter areas when compared to students who were not participating in the bilingual program, but were significantly higher in language acquisition.

Other factors that have been alluded to in the research as having an effect on school achievement by the bilingual are elements not directly evident within the school. These elements have to do with

the home and community environment in which the child exists. The educational-linguistic background of the parents has been found to have positive correlations with the achievement of the children in the school. Generally it is argued that the more acculturated the parents are, the better the child will be able to achieve in school. It is also assumed that the more acculturated the child is, the better he will be able to achieve in school. These speculations are not supported by research. However, one study points out that forced acculturation may well have very negative reactions.

Lack of teacher awareness regarding the socioculture of the bilingual-bicultural has been isolated as a main factor in the educational retardation of the Mexican-American and the Indian-American children. These studies attribute, that because the teachers and administrators are unaware of sociocultural differences, the school curriculum tends to be middle-class WASP oriented. Because of this lack of awareness and because of the school's middle-class orientation, the bilingual child tends to feel out of place in the school socioculture. These negative attitudes lead to isolation, defensiveness, and anxiety on the part of the bilingual child and in turn, bear on his academic achievement. The teachers, being unaware of the chasm between the socioculture of the school and the sociocultural background of the children, inflict further wounds by causing culture conflict through their teaching approaches and techniques.

All of the studies concerned with lack of educational gain among the bilingual explain the phenomena in the terms described above, such as the lack of experiential background, factors of acculturation, lack of teacher awareness of sociocultural differences, the attitude of the children, and culture conflict. No study was found which attempted to measure the reliability and validity of achievement tests on the market today when applied to bilingual-bicultural children, especially those who come from impoverished conditions.

The prestige of bilingualism is directly related to the status within the larger social setting that the bilingual minority group occupies. In the Southwest the bilingual Mexican-American minority has consistently occupied a position of lower status of prestige than the Anglo-American. Only recently has the Spanish language emerged as a desirable second language for the English-speaking majority. Even for the Spanish-speaking Mexican-American, knowledge of the Spanish language has been a dubious asset. There are definite limitations or ceilings placed on minority group members. Even though the Anglo world is a world of almost unlimited levels of accessibility to the status they could occupy and the roles they could play is limited because of culturally binding factors. Some of these factors are lack of broad time orientation, lack of future-time self projection, and lack of competitive drives. It is not sufficient for them to have high aspirational levels. The teachings of the schools that hard work, a given amount of gumption, and a little bit of luck are component parts of unlimited success, are in variance to the harsh realities of life.

Instead, status and role allocations are determined by the majority group, and only a small number of minority group members are allowed upward mobility. The repression of large numbers may be a factor of discrimination and allowing upward mobility to a small elite may be subconsciously perpetrated to avoid recrimination. When large number of minority group members have tried to move upward and cannot pass this ceiling, they have few choices left. One choice available to them is horizontal mobility under that ceiling still within the Anglo world but with definite minority group status. Another is to bounce back into the Mexican-American world and lead a life of anomic behavior. Others become so disenchanted they succumb to total personality disorganization, existing in the never-never world of abysmia in the culture of poverty.

One of the ways in which the minority group member differs from the world of the Anglo-American is in status. The Anglo-American is the group in power, controlling the economic base, reward-punishment patterns, and status roles, while the minority group is at the mercy of the Anglo-American. Historically all minorities in the United States have lost their sociocultural identity, and thereby their native language within two or three generations after migration. With this type of repression, the minority group bilingual attests that his lack of proficiency in the English language is the cause of his misery and his "accent" is the identifying factor by which he is isolated as a foreigner. In this frame of mind the parent is in no mood to let his children learn his native dialect "because he will have an accent."

Often the problems associated with minority groups from cultures other than Anglo-American are lumped together under the label "bilingualism." This is done because bilingualism is the most obvious differentiating factor of the minority group member. Poverty, low educational attainment levels, cultural conflict, social disorganization, and personality disorganization are all factors, not so obvious and therefore, not often taken into consideration. Educators tend to think that if only the minority group child would acquire proficiency in English, all of the problems of educating that child would be solved. Educators who have been studying the problems of education of minority group children or bilingual minority group children are fairly convinced that language problems are actually symtomatic of deeper, underlying problems.

Some recent studies on acculturation have indicated that there is a low relationship between acculturation and educational attainment levels. However, these results may be due to the fact that there are no standardized instruments available for measuring the extent of acculturation. Nontheless, other spin-offs from the process of acculturation have clearly indicated there are strong relationships between the personality development of the individual and the stage of acculturation in which he finds himself.

For the purposes of this discussion, the acculturation will mean the process by which an individual moves in his behavior from one sociocultural setting to another. There are several accompanying phenomena which affect the personality of the individual as he gets involved in the process of acculturation. In one of the first studies in acculturation, Herskovitz described the process in terms of diffusion, assimilation, acceptance, adaptation, and reaction. All of these variables play an important part in analyzing bilingualism.

Acculturation is more selective for the adult than for the child. The adult can select from the culture that which has resemblances to the familiar and add his store of new learning as they are needed. In general, the adult can retain his identity in his own ethnic cultural cluster. But for the child who is in the process of learning the social roles, the sociocultural selections create much more stress.

Acculturation can be conceived as a continum of stages of development. Starting with the native culture as the point of departure, one can delineate at least four stages up to the time when the individual becomes completely acculturated into a second culture. If the group is in the process of amalgamation, but this time the individual has fully disassociated himself from the native culture. If biculturism is the goal of the group, dual culturization has taken place and the individual becomes emotionally committed to two cultures--his native culture and the second culture. The first stage of acculturation can be characterized by bewilderment.

If the individual is capable of overcoming the many negative forces of the new culture, he then acquires a degree of independence by having acquired greater functionality in the new culture. With more acculturation, that is, learning and internalizing new sociocultural norms and behaviors, the individual finds that the rewards of the socioculture complex become more readily available to him. At the same time a subconscious, emotional change has been occuring and the rewards that heretofore had been undesirable or incomprehensible now become desirable and meaningful to him.

The third stage of acculturation can be characterized by deliberate regression of the individual to his native culture. In this stage the individual likes to think of himself as being both bilingual and bicultural. The fourth stage of acculturation is the stage of biculturism. Here the individual truly understands the major aspects of both sociocultures and has developed a wholesome functionality in both. Further along in the continuum, as the individual learns English but retains a given amount of language interference of his native dialect, he is made conscious that it is not desirable to have a "foreign accent." As he starts to develop into the second stage of acculturation, the intonation patterns of the individual become definitely melodramatic. As the individual matures physicall, mentally, and spiritually, he begins to see that he has been playing a rather confusing, melodramatic, and nonsensical game. He has been able to achieve and overcompensate. He has

acquired status in the new society and is contented with it. For the first time, he begins to look at himself. He takes stock of his accomplishments in relation to the place from which he started. He is proud of himself for having achieved so much. However, mingled with this pride is an uneasy feeling of having left so many "good things" behind--his friends, his parents, and the way of life of childhood. Nostalgia sets in, overpowers the individual. A sense of often having used almost inhuman means for achievement of goals, and definitely sacrificing love and abandoning the home, develop in the individual extreme guilt feelings.

It is this stage that the individual starts taking stock of the language from which he had tried to disassociate himself for so many years. He starts trying to redevelop his dexterities in his native language. He will begin to listen more to Spanish radio programs, for example, in the case of the Mexican-American. He will start reading more books in his native language, frequenting theatres in his native language, and in short, start again the process of exaggerating his sociocultural origin.

It is unfortunate in the history of minority groups that acculturation has actually destroyed and annihilated their native culture. It has been the history of all minority groups, that within two or three generations, all vestiges of the native culture and mother language have been lost. As minority cultural groups acculturate, they cease to exist as cultural entities. They join the general milieu of the Anglo-American society, having lost the essence of their culture and language in the process. The loss of the language precipitated the loss of the culture, and the loss of the culture reinforced the loss of the language.

Because of the proximity to Mexico and the constant influx from Mexico, Mexican-Americans of the Southwest have maintained their cultural ties with Mexico, and in a large part have been able to retain much of their mother language. They have come to the realization that they have been victims of serious injustice and vicious discrimination. This group has tried to amalgamize and all has come to naught. The new tack that this group is following is that of cultural resurgence and indentification. These people want the right and responsibility to determine their own destiny.

What then is the bicultural individual, and what is the relationship of biculturism to bilingualism? The relationship between biculturism and bilingualism is a natural, intrinsic bond. While it is possible to be bicultural to some extent without knowing the language of the second culture, true biculturism cannot be achieved without high levels of proficiency in the languages of both cultures.

Over and beyond being proficient and dexterous in playing roles and knowing the communication systems of either culture, the individual has developed within himself a deep sense of perception. He has been able to penetrate into the fantasy roles and the idiosyncracies of the value system of both sociocultures. He has become convinced that both

sociocultures are nothing more than stages in which people act and play games. It must be remembered, however, that many individuals even though dexterous in the communication system of both cultures, are so emotionally entangled with the idiosyncracies of either or both cultures, that they are marginal people instead of true biculturals. They neither have the emotional fortitude nor the spiritual development to become biculturals. In a true sense, they are the victims of the conflicts of two sociocultures that spring from two different (and conflicting) ethics.

The primary thrust of bilingual education, of course, is the inclusion to some degree of a second language other than the official language of the school. On the surface this would seem to be a simple enough objective. When the educator attempts to implement this objective, however, he finds that there are innumerable problems, repercussions, and implications that have to be considered. One of these is the use to which the second language is going to be placed. Is the program going to use the native dialect of the child to move him faster into adequate proficiency in English so as to insure him of normal progress in schooling?

Another decision that has to be made is what aspects of the program are to be taught in which language. For the purposes of developing scopes and sequences, it would seem that it makes little difference which language will be used in the instruction of any subject matter. In other words, the development of objectives, whether in English or in a second language, need not present anymore difficulty than they would in a monolingual program.

One factor must be considered, however, in delineating the subject matter areas and the different concepts that are to be taught in one language or another. The bilingual child, because of his psycholinguistic tendencies, would perhaps understand better and become more emotionally committed to certain concepts and principles if they were taught in one language rather than another.

Perhaps the gravest consideration that has to be taken in establishing a bilingual program is the end product that one wishes to have developed through the bilingual program. Is the ultimate aim of the program to develop all bilingual children into middle class, WASP models? Is it to develop an individual who can operate in two languages, but whose basic core values are those of an Anglo middle-class American? Or is it to develop an individual who has adequate facility to function both linguistically and socially in two sociocultures? What is the effect on the bilingual, bicultural child of this consistent insistence on middle-class behavior in the school setting? The research is rather scant in this area. Nonetheless, the educators who have worked with these children for several years are convinced that it has serious negative effects on these children. Thus, it is not unusual to see the statement: "One of the purposes of the bilingual program is to develop a better self concept."

Much more important in the bilingual, bicultural program is the concept of compensatory education. Taking the totality of the sociocultural world of the bilingual child, and the sociocultural world in which the child is expected to function one finds that there are gaps in his growth and development. Over and beyond taking the ordinary growth and development patterns for which the schools assume responsibility, the bilingual, bicultural program can attempt to implement activities and structures whereby these children will blossom out in these areas that heretofore had been neglected. For example, the bilingual, bicultural child coming from an impoverished home should be given the opportunity to learn what the so-called "better things in life" are.

Bilingual education should not penalize the bilingual child in other areas of growth and development. It must be clearly understood that regardless of how nostalgic or how enthusiastic the program developer of bilingual education may be, there is no merit in learning a new language just for the sake of knowing it. If the bilingual, bicultural program does not do anything to develop a more integrated personality and enhance a better self concept in the bilingual child, perhaps it would be better that bilingual education not be attempted. If the child is going to be penalized in other areas of development for the sake of learning another language without ample justification, careful stock should be taken of our motives. In short, bilingual-bicultural education should open the doors for the bilingual child, broaden his horizons, and enhance a more integrated development of his personality.

Speech delivered by Michael J. Cantu at
San Antonio, Texas, and Monte Corona, California.

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT THROUGH EFFECTIVE USE OF MASS MEDIA COMMUNICATION

In considering the use of mass media for communication, it is important to remember that studies have shown repeatedly that there are rarely any attitude shifts by use of mass media alone. Other studies have found that the first message a person accepts about a program, an event, or an issue has the most influence on his opinions. He will usually resist later attempts to change his opinions. The schools must, therefore, tell their story first before the public is exposed to poorly founded opinions from other sources. The school's responsibility is to define the message and get it to the public. The best way we know of is person-to-person communication. Since this is virtually impossible, in most situations, we must depend on the mass media.

In 1965, while doing a story for the Express-News, I visited the Laredo project United Consolidated ISD. I observed the program used by the schools and was very impressed with the fact that all students were involved in Bilingual education, Anglos as well as Mexican-Americans. The schools were teaching bilingually all the subjects to all the students. The native English speakers were learning Spanish and the native Spanish speakers were learning English. On the playground, the children were talking bilingually. This program has continued and is now used in all six grades involved.

To me, the definition of a bilingual program means, or should mean, something along the lines of the Laredo project-involvement for all. In many cases the term bilingual education is not being used correctly. Too often it is presented as a program only for the educactionally disadvantaged, those entering school with little or no knowledge of English and in need of remedial type work. This means the bilingual teaching part is phased out as soon as the children can speak sufficient English. Why not stress its benefits to all. If the community is to be involved, the program must be one that involves the community. To equate the concept with remedial work only and stress only one of its many applications, is negative and cannot get widespread support from the community. The program will only have the support of a few parents, the parents of the children who need this type of remedial education. It is a good program, but only for a few identified as needing it and who will be taken out of it as soon as possible; it therefore, has a built-in termination point. More thought must be given the general cultural improvement aspect; that is, that bilingual education represents an improvement in educational offerings for all. In short, what is needed is a positive approach to the subject.

It may seem that we have gotten away from the subject but we are actually just getting into it. When we set out to communicate with

the public in order to get involvement and support for a program, we are actually talking about selling the program. We are saying that this plan represents an improvement in education and therefore, it should be supported. When spotlighting a program and attesting to its performance, we must be able to interpret the program through written materials, talks, and explanations. You must be able to tell what it means to all involved and answer the basic questions of why we are using bilingual education. Point out what subjects are being taught bilingually, and most important be able to relate how this will affect the total school program. Perhaps the first and last questions are the most important in communicating and getting support. The key is communication.

When talking about getting community support through the news media, we are talking about communications; person-to-person would be best, but we depend on the news media, or other media to be considered later.

Talking about good performances to bring about support and reaction is very necessary to a program. Perhaps one of the best examples of this is Paul Revere's ride. How many of us know that actually three men rode that night but that Longfellow, when choosing to write about one, spotlighted Revere. Longfellow acted as a public relation agent and Revere's name is now synonymous with the ride though there were others. So, what we are talking about is public relations. Some call it community relations, but it is all the same. The idea is to communicate with the public. Do schools have to resort to public relations? Yes, especially to gain support for programs and explain expenditure of funds, public funds.

Before the public is informed, it is important to make certain that the school system itself know about the program. The board should be informed in detail as they represent the elected officials and are opinion leaders. Then we have the superintendent, other teachers and staff. In communicating with the other teachers and staff, perhaps one of the most effective ways would be through an existing school district newsletter, the teachers organization publication, or some device like including some information in the next envelope with their paycheck. It is most important that the school system's personnel know about the program. The system's employees will certainly be asked about it and they must be informed as to what is going on.

Now we are ready for the public. The mass media includes the newspapers, radio, and television. Neither of these should be neglected. We must also think of newsletters, reports and other types of direct mailing to groups we want to reach - the selective media. First we will consider the mass media. The best friend of the communicator is the telephone. Call the newspaper offices and talk to the city editor. Tell him about the program and what it has to offer. Call the radio and television people, tell them what you have. Make an appointment to visit with them and explain the program in detail. Don't try to sell only one aspect of the program. A good reporter will ask questions and might like some other angle. That is a good sign; you have his interest.

It is important to consider what segment of the community you want to reach and what type of reactions you want. If you want acceptance of the program and support, remember to interpret the various aspects of the plan. Please, please, please, don't deliver a lot of education jargon. Explain the concepts in simple language and there will be no misunderstanding. Tricky terms sound pretty, but too often they are new names for old ideas, and the news media will be able to figure this out and may lose interest before you get to the heart of your program.

A person who views the schools from the standpoint of a citizen has a commitment of interest in public affairs in general. A person with a parent's viewpoint is interested in the school mainly because he has children in attendance and it becomes a personal interest.

Avoid publicity efforts that aim at achieving vague or hazy results. Key what relatively little effort your're allowed to give to program public relations with <u>specific</u> and <u>worthwhile</u> goals. <u>Nothing hazy</u>. Identify goals before you begin. Keep the reaction in mind. What do you want? Do you want the people to visit the school? Understanding? Remember that the media is for masses but surveys show you must aim approaches at individual audiences. Get a feel for the media you are considering approaching. Here we go back to the original point in my talk, the <u>reason</u> for the program. Consider your goals in getting community support. What kind of support do you want? <u>Never let this be forgotten</u>. <u>Be positive</u>.

Most large newspapers have education writers. Smaller papers will have general writers. Know who you will deal with. Try to identify members of the media who live in the school district and therefore, have a special stake in it because their children will be involved. Invite the reporter to visit the school. Studies have found that less than two percent of the local newspaper, on the average, is devoted to school news. With this amount of coverage, school sports events receive about half the space. There may, of course, be exceptions to this. It might differ with different papers.

I think it might be of interest to you to note here that the Institute for Communication Research at Stanford conducted a study involving interviewing of registered voters in different school districts over the nation. The study was undertaken in connection with bond campaigns, but one of its findings was of a general nature. Voters interviewed reported that they depended primarily on newspapers and conversations with friends for information about the schools, but they indicated that they would prefer to talk directly with someone representing the schools. At the University of Southern California, Clarence Harold Bloom in his doctoral dissertation found that the most effective medium for disseminating school news to the community was the local newspaper. He also found the majority of parents of school children consider themselves well informed. Fewer than half, with no children in school, had this feeling.

Never depend completely upon the written word. Less than two percent of the television and radio time is devoted to education, but these are important channels of communication. Kenneth Winfield, in his study on mass media done while he was studying at Temple University, found that 86 million Americans over the age of 12 spend slightly more than five hours per day watching television. Television is present in four out of five homes. Winfield also found that the total number of hours devoted to radio listening per home per week was 24 hours. Nearly every car today has a radio and people driving to and from work, or those that are in their car for any amount of time, become almost a captive audience to radio news media.

Radio and television stations have public service time available at no charge. Go out and talk to the station's program manager and tell them about the program. Write out a summary on a sheet of paper to leave with him. Ask for some public service announcements; the station is always looking for good material. It is important to remember that radio is highly selective of the material it runs - especially in the case of large cities. Study each station and determine its audience. Identify the stations. There are also the background stations that have only music - and the foreground stations, those that invite speakers and interview them. In the case of interview shows on television, call the interviewer and tell him about your program. Interest him in some special aspect that will interest his viewers and you will probably wind up on the show.

In a recent U. S. Office of Education publication, "Putting Research into Education Practice,"Dr. Kenneth Tanner of the University of Tennessee came to the following conclusions when considering Mass Media in School-Community Relations.

1. He recommended that school personnel should be encouraged to maintain a positive image.

2. If schools are aware of the opinion leaders in the community, specific messages should be directed toward them and their opinions should be solicited.

3. The school message should be short, written in plain language with comprehensive sentences.

4. When preparing school-made radio and television programs, consider their appeal to certain target audiences.

The telephone is a very useful instrument when dealing with person-to-person contact and when calling one's news source. Remember, though, if you have a feature story in mind and offer it to one source, don't go to another source immediately unless it is a news story. If it is to be a feature, that is a different matter. For general dissemination of information, the newsrelease probably is the most effective. If it is well written, it will often end up in the paper or on the air as it was

with no changes made. Ask the school district disseminator to help write your newsrelease or turn it out for you. If he is not available, enlist the help of one of the high school journalism teachers. Send it out neatly typed or run it off in mimeographed form and send it to the news media in the community. It is most important to list names and telephone numbers correctly. If there are no sources of dissemination available to you, let the news media handle the writing and putting it into proper form.

Again, don't overlook the newsletter, get information in the district newsletter. Most large districts and many smaller ones have a newsletter - find the person who writes and assembles it and ask for space. Keep the information brief and write about the program as simply as possible. Have someone outside the school read over it to make sure everyone can understand it. Think about running the newsletter on colored paper. Quite a bit can be done by just changing the paper if you do it yourselves. Also to be considered are direct letters and open house discussions. Brochures are also valuable tools for explaining the total program, goals, and etc. It should be done professionally or by someone in the district familiar with this type of work. This is an important part of dissemination. Newsletters, district or for bilingual program only, do not have to be formal. They can be a mimeographed sheet. Have the children take it home. The newsletter will explain the program, its progress and other current information.

The reason for all of this publication is to promote understanding and support from the public affected by the program. In identifying who should receive these materials, include the parents, they should even be brought in on the planning of the programs whenever possible; the opinion leaders - identify these people in the community affected, talk to them personally and take them these materials so they will understand; the rest of the school community and board. Most important of all, decide definitely what the function of the publication will be - what it is supposed to do. Then decide on the format. Also remember that the information should be in the proper style for the publication. If a newsrelease-get help of journalism teachers or district communicator. Do not fall victim to copyitis, that is, taking a publication you like that has been produced by someone else and trying to make it fit your needs. Be careful of your wording. Remember that the layman still does not know what team teaching really means - or inquiry, or process teaching. If understanding is sought, aim for it and don't back off.

I have not mentioned this before but feel that speaking engagements are also important. Service clubs and PTA are always looking for speakers. Send their presidents a summary of your program and tell them you are available to talk at their meetings. The main reason for this effort is involvement - involvement to help make programs that will better educate children a reality.

This talk has been intended to look at the many ways to bring about community support for programs and also formulation of programs. I feel

that parent involvement is very important. Mass media is also important but there are other ways. In using mass media, it is necessary to be selective. Examine the program that is being promoted. If the program is basically negative or has some negative aspects, it will be hard to promote. See if the program is in its best possible form. Who is interested in it? Use the right terms in describing the program. If the program is of a bilingual form, then use the term. If it is not bilingual, call it something else. Bilingual is an "in" term right now educationally, but it might not have anything to do with the program you are trying to promote and the bilingual concept may be hurt because of misuse of the term. Take the initiative in approaching media and the public. Be clear in the communication. Many problems in getting community support are based on lack of proper communication, and,therefore do not get off to a good start.

Above all, decide what it is that you want to tell and why you want to tell it. After you've gotten that first story in the paper or on television and radio, then begin thinking of different approaches and new information; don't continue trying for story coverage on what has already been published. Look for new aspects of the program. Consider the media and decide which type of media would be best for your purposes. It might be that mass media is not for you and you need selective media. Think about the situation. Don't forget the opinion leaders and direct contact with the parents. Talks wherever possible. Remember a communication program can be more effective if aimed at specific segments of the population which may either support or oppose the schools. These are the groups which will influence the large percentage of persons who do not usually give school matters much attention. -- And, no copying please!

Suggested Reading Materials

PREP materials now available through the service centers, especially those on bilingual education and those on community relations programs.

The PR Gold Mine books published by NSPRA

The book of Schools and the Press published by NSPRA, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036)

Speech delivered by Victor Cruz-Aedo,
at San Antonio, Texas

IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Schools encounter common problems but at times the problems are unusual. The fact that a school exists in a bilingual and bicultural community leads to definite differences, some sharp, some subtle, but all are critical. Communities are likely to be at different levels in their acceptance of the majority culture. The administration will do well to assiduously listen, observe and determine for his community its general level of acceptance of the other cultural values. The alert administrator needs to discover its dynamics for change, to what extent and in which direction the community is moving. In these bilingual-bicultural communities the administrator needs to act with caution, forbearance, and most of all with understanding. He must pay intense heed to his community. He must dedicate much time in visitations, pulsing the parents, listening to his teachers, teacher aides, and pupils. The teachers in bilingual schools will require administrative support of a warmth and depth not usually afforded the teaching personnel.

After study, observation and monitoring programs that stress the reconstitution of teachers to serve the Mexican-American, the dominant impression gained was a lack of relevance between teacher preparation in the academics and professional competence and the demands of teaching the bilingual child. Fully certified teachers with experience were frustated and traditional teaching materials proved ineffective. Supplementary services in the form of teacher aides and additional hardware, though meant to help, provided only fire to their frustrations. Prior training did very little to prepare them for their present assignments. Their training:

1. Lacked practical applications.
2. Stressed theoretical abstractions.
3. Provided inappropriate subject matter.
4. Failed to face up to the actual problem of the Mexican-American.
5. Failed to make the teacher aware that the methods, content, and materials were ineffective.
6. Convinced them that their approach was not right and that it could not possibly work.
7. Involved them, more pathetically, simply because they did not know better.

What constitutes a good teacher? For decades educators have attempted to provide an answer. It has been my observation that teachers that were effective, in my estimation, were ineffective in the sight of others. Certainly, diverse viewpoints have been expressed and various models have been presented; and in spite of all efforts, disagreement

still prevails, and we are searching for effective teachers.

Children, like plants and flowers, grow continually. It follows that their language power, too, grows continually. Teachers, like the gardener, need to know when children, like the flowers, need the sunshine of stimulation (motivation), the shade of relaxation (success), and the fertilizer of rich experience (involvement). We cannot teach children dead, dull language learnings. This is exactly what has been occurring for many decades in many of our schools. Nothing happens in an educational vacuum. This vacuum has been the educational ambiance of many of the Spanish-speaking children. Somehow we need to have the green thumb skill of the professional classroom teacher who knows how to prescribe for the continual progress of her group toward educational achievement. Briefly, let me give you a simple definition of good teaching. A good teacher uses herself, her talents, and her surroundings in a fashion that helps both her pupils and herself achieve satisfaction; their own, teacher and learner and society's too. If the staff members are to experience satisfaction through a feeling of competency, the school must implement a strong program of in-service training that prepares for emerging tasks in bilingual education. Some of our administrators cannot assume that training institutions prepare teachers with all the skills they need for teaching in bilingual programs nor should they assume that because some speak Spanish they are ready to teach all content areas.

Teachers want to feel that they are growing. They want to avoid dead-end jobs or positions that have them going through the same routine day after day without opportunity to learn new procedures and skills. They want to engage in creative activities that increase their knowledge and ability. To this end in-service training programs must take a new direction. Attempts to improve the staff cannot be confined entirely to the addition of new members. In fact, the major responsibility of increased strength is through in-service training for the present members of the group. Teacher growth is promoted through the kind of faculty organization that encourages teachers to exert leadership by stating their problems, by devising ways of seeking solutions, by participating in decision-making, and by accepting responsibility for the outcome.

In order to develop such a structure, there are certain steps that the administrators must take. Administration must help develop:

1. A permissive climate in which creativity is valued and diversity of opinion is recognized as an asset.
2. The type of situation in which each individual feels worthwhile because he has a contribution to make and a belief in his ability to make it.
3. The type of communication where people hear each other and become increasingly sensitive to the feelings of others.
4. A common understanding that leadership is a function of the group and consists of a contribution that an individual makes to help a group determine and carry out goals.
5. Techniques by which the group can identify problems and locate necessary information and resource people to solve them.

6. Evaluation procedures through which the group constantly improves the processes that it uses and the goals it has established.

As administrators promote growth through in-service, the process is in harmony with the principles that underlie all good learning situations. The administrators recognize that:

1. Learning occurs at all times.
2. The learning that occurs in a given situation is determined by his purposes, his needs, and his past experiences.
3. When force is applied from without, the learning may be opposite of what is desired.
4. The learning of a teacher will approach what the administration (supervisor) expects when both teacher and supervisor feel secure and when both have had a part in establishing purposes.
5. The teacher, supervisor, principal learn simultaneously. Teacher growth is promoted when teachers exchange ideas and when they are encouraged to test the hypothesis they establish.

Programs of curriculum improvement constitute in-service training. Too frequently it has been assumed that there are separate functions. As teachers work on identifying inadequacies in the present program, on seeking changes in policy or curriculum content, or on devising operational procedures, they are growing in insight and in teaching skill. They themselves improve as they work to improve the program. Underlying any program of improvement is a genuine belief in people. If in-service training is to be successful, the supervisor must believe that his colleagues can grow. If he does not have confidence in their abilities to grow educationally, this vital nucleus to the program will sense his lack of confidence and will make little use of the experiences that are provided. But if the supervisor has a real belief in the possibilities of his staff and lets them know it, they will attempt to live up to his expectations and in many instances the participants will surpass his expectations.

In-service training is not something that is provided by the official leader for other members of the staff. He must participate too. Many administrators have made the mistake of assuming that it is their job to provide in-service training for others. Such an assumption makes clear to the staff that the administrator considers himself at a higher level. If, on the other hand, the administrator shares the in-service opportunities with the staff, he will grow with them in ability and in a sense of working together. He will be accepted as one of the group, rather than as an outsider who is trying to do something to the group. In-service training must not be haphazard. The first task of the official leader is to learn what type is needed. Some clues come from evaluation. As a staff evaluates itself and the school program, the areas of weakness indicate the experiences that should be made available.

Another source of guidance is the direction the school program is

taking. If the faculty has agreed to institute certain changes in the curriculum and if a practical approach is being made to the transition, a careful study must be undertaken to determine if the faculty members possess the skills necessary to follow through. If they do not, the function of the in-service is obvious. Curriculum programs have often failed because this step was not taken. One of the purposes of in-service is to provide for a growing togetherness of all. All faculties need to feel that they are a unit, that they are teams, working for a common purpose. Some phase of the in-service program should be held at a place where the members of the group are away from distracting influences and have a chance to really learn to know each other in many different ways. In-service training is most profitable when it is centered on improving the school program. The program should not be confined to experiences that provoke only academic growth. Many times a faculty will be further advanced in its academic learning than in other abilities that make the success of the school program possible.

Growth in ability to work with others, teachers and teacher aides, improved skill in the democratic process, the development of social skills, and the rounding out of the individual as a social being may all be areas in which teachers need more help than they do with methods of teaching or with content. This is particularly true in bilingual education programs.

A faculty may be involved with emotional problems that create stress and strain among its members. Cooperation is impossible under these circumstances. In such a situation an in-service training program must provide as its first step, experiences that will enable people to relieve themselves of the emotional tensions that hinder constructive work.

For this purpose in-service training may include recreation, dramatics, arts and crafts, as well as more formalized activities. In-service training may take other forms. It is not always getting together for common experiences. Reading, attending conferences, or other types of individual experiences can be in-service growth experience.

One of the most important kinds of in-service training is participation in an experimental program such as those you are involved in. An examination of the history of staffs in schools that have participated in experimental programs leads to the conclusion that such participation produces people who are stronger and more capable. People grow as they have a chance to try something new, and as they come to look upon their tasks as a chance to explore better ways of teaching, better ways of equipping them with more knowledge in culture, history and in other areas.

It should be noted that the schools that have been most successful in their in-service training program have made the training programs a part of the teacher's work load. It has not been something added to the already full schedule of a hard working teacher. It does not come at the end of a school day when the teacher's thoughts are focused upon aspects of life other than school work.

Some schools have worked in-service preschool into training conferences, this practice has been part of many of our 19 projects. Official

leaders must let the public know that in-service training cost money. It is an up-grading process to produce more effective teachers. It involves the expenditure of money to obtain a new breed of Americans. Administrators should not rely solely on federal funds. Local funds should be used not only for pre-service, in-service training programs but for implementing the school programs that are needed. The emerging role of the teacher aide needs to be explored, at least superficially, at this symposium. The involvement of the bilingual aide and the monolingual English-speaking teacher is of prime consideration.

The tasks assigned to teachers and teacher aides for execution need to be clearly defined. Who doubts that a teacher could probably better spend time in diagnosing the needs of the children, rather than counting lunch money or other activities that may not require a college education? Who would expect a teacher aide to deci · which children should be in various reading groups? Each have cer. skills and responsibilities. The aide might best be helpful in preparing the necessary materials for the pupils and the teacher after the teacher has determined what materials are essential.

If role definitions are clearly specified and accepted by both the teacher and the teacher aide, two critical problems may be avoided:

1. Not using all the skills that the aide possesses and thus underutilizing her abilities in the learning-teaching process of the child.
2. Expecting the aides to make critical decisions or perform tasks for which they are not trained, thus calling for the over utilization of the aides.

The teacher is a highly trained professional who is able too:

1. Diagnose the needs of children.
2. Plan ways and prescribe activities to meet the needs of children.
3. Coordinate the activities between teacher and pupils, teacher aide and pupils, pupils themselves, teacher and teacher aide for the sole purpose of providing optimal learning ambiance for all children.

In other words, the teacher aide supplements the learning-teaching process by using those special skills brought to the school from the aide's bilingual and bicultural background more frequently similar to the background of the children than that of the regular teacher, and the knowledge of the community.

The learning-teaching process is continuous for all participants, pupils, teacher aides, teachers, administrators, and the parents. When additional supportive staff is added for the benefit of the pupils and teachers, it is essential to define and develop roles and to interpret these roles to others. We know the complexity of the teaching-learning

process and we know that significant changes must be made in our educational system if education is to have relevancy with the children in our bilingual-bicultural projects. As we work and think through the changing roles, traditional vs. bilingual-bicultural, fully using the competencies of all the personnel involved, care must be exercised not to bring about more efficient ways to do "old things," but, better still, to determine better ways to do "new things."

Our public schools enroll about 500,000 Mexican-Americans. Conservatively one half are in dire need of help in learning English as a foreign language. The percentage of dropouts is extremely high, 80%, before they finish 12 years of schooling. The traditional method of teaching has been that one teacher faces rooms of pupils and lectures dead, dull language learnings. She proceeds to question for specific answers. A new role is emerging and is needed urgently for teachers, as they learn to plan and to coordinate the contributions of others, teacher aide in the classroom, that of team-teaching. Teacher and teacher aides can learn from cross-training and cross-socialization in joint sessions. These sessions must include the administrator and other specialized personnel as well as the teacher and teacher aides. These sessions produce a highly valuable exchange of knowledge, life experience and a positive outlook toward education in the 1970's. Additionally, these sessions can introduce the teacher aide to many of the expectations the professionals have for the position of teacher aide. I visualize structured training of teachers, teacher aides, administrators, and parents with whom the aides will be working to prove most useful. I recall one session last summer during a pre-service orientation I held on the behavior patterns of the Mexican-American. A traditional monolingual English-speaking teacher was indignant that a child would not look up at her when she reprimanded the child. She described him as disrespectful because he looked down. A Mexican-American aide was able to point out that such behavior was, in fact, a sign of respect from the child in his culture.

In-service training can make the difference in our bilingual projects. Let's add the three "Z's" to our in-service program--zest, zip, zing.

Speech delivered at San Antonio, Texas, by
Dr. Américo Paredes, Professor of English
and of Anthropology, The University of Texas.

FOLKLORE IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION

My subject, in general, is whether folklore has any bearing on the teaching of bilingualism and biculturalism. I suppose that one of the first things one ought to do is try to define folklore, we might try that and spend perhaps a couple of hours. I am teaching a class right now where we have been defining it for several weeks, but I think a good operational definition that we could use for folklore is; the unofficial heritage of a people. All people have what we might call an official heritage; an official culture, literature, things comprising what is sometimes called the great tradition. They also have a little tradition of the world. For example, we might have national heroes and then all the official heroes might have local heroes as well. You might have sophisticated music, literature, and art. You also might have local legends and special jokes that circulate. Now here, we are referring to the unofficial culture of any nationality that we have. Countries such as this one and others. Brazil is a very good example, where you have a number of minority groups; you have another quite interesting situation because folklore is of very special importance to minority groups; not just any minority group, but to those groups that are distinguished as minority groups because they speak a different language. This becomes very important because even the language comes into play, while the official culture is represented by the majority, and that is the language that is usually taught in the schools and the folk culture is the minority language. On the national scale for example, the most important one would be that of the Finns who, by the way, have the greatest most extensive folklore archives in the world. In Finland, folklore is a very important thing. Their national epic of course, the Kalavala, was put together from a group of folk songs that they collected and their poetic additions were to bridge the middle gaps between the folk songs and make it one. The Finns were, for many generations, centuries perhaps, dominated either by the Russians or by the Swedes so that there were periods in their national history when Swedish was taught in the schools and Finnish was a completely oral language, thus, the richness of Finnish folklore. Irish for example, the topic language itself, is another example of this particular situation, and again, it is no accident that the second largest archives in Europe on folklore are in Ireland.

So, folklore is indeed important to groups of this sort. Here, we are dealing with minority groups in which the language is the identifying part. One of the most important parts in identifying the group as a folk group is identifying it as a minority group. This plays a very important part in folklore and to the Mexican-American, I suppose, folklore in a very special way is an important thing. I think I might try

to explain this by making a parallel with the most numerous and important minority in this country, the American Negro. Of course, American Negro activists these days are ever so eagerly emphasizing certain African heritage, but if you look at them from the Mexican-American point of view, they are Anglo Americans. They are black Anglo Saxon protestants, and as far as culture is concerned, their way of thinking, at least, is characteristically Anglo American. Looking beyond the Mexican-American group onward to the other groups, many important differences are noticed. But, what has been said about the Negro: his Africanism, his Negro characteristics, his skin color features and hair? It is very interesting to note especially among those dealing with the American Negro folklore that there has been a special focus on hair. Some of my colleagues explain this in sex terms. Of course, how else would you explain it? The hair is a sex symbol and this is why it is emphasized. I believe that there could be one other explanation. Perhaps the most exclusive Negro characteristic is skin color. Other varieties of the human species which have very dark skin features vary considerably even among all peoples. It is this particular feature that, as far as I know, is typical of the things that has been characteristic of the Negro in the past; trying to get away from his own identity has been the use of hair straightener. This is typical of the Negro trying to belong; trying to deny his own identity; trying to flee from himself. Again, it is no accident that among the young activists Afro hair styles are the symbol of independence. This is their way of saying, "I am black and I am proud of being black!" Of course, you have heard the "Black is Beautiful" slogan. When this particular feeling is put into action it is emphasized by the Afro hairdo.

That which sets the Mexican-American apart to a great extent is the Spanish language. I am sure a great many of you know of the efforts among individual Mexican-Americans to deny their Spanish language. I was just talking to two young Mexican-Americans interested in Mexican-American studies in California and this matter of language came up. One of them said, "the trouble is that in Los Angeles, almost none of the Mexican-Americans speak Spanish any more." They were saying, "this is not right, they do know the language, but they pretend they don't speak it; the fact is they really don't want to." In other words, this is our brand of hair straightener as far as I am concerned. It has the same effect in that it tends to create a tremendous problem in the individual. He knows what he is and is trying to deny it; trying to be what he is not; trying to deny everything in his misguided effort that this will make him a better American; while, on the contrary, it will make him a lesser citizen.

There is a difference between the American Negro situation and ours, perhaps in that the pressures built upon the past on the middle class Negro to conform, to try to look white and so on, were, you might say, indirect. This of course is another thing that is pretty well known and again, young activists have emphasized it. For example, advertisements in which the model of beauty was always the white man. We

are faced perhaps with even greater problems because, as you know, there has been in the past very direct and conservative efforts to extricate the Spanish language from the child - unfortunately in the schools. This has not been true only in the United States with the Spanish speakers.

Some Irish folklorist have told me that in the past, when Ireland was part of England, if a child spoke the Irish language in school he was given a little rod with matches for everytime he had spoken it, and the parent was supposed to whip him that number of times when he got home.

Not too long ago in my memory, I remember one of the schools in Brownsville where the assistant principal walked around the playground. Of course, this stifling of everything that he is, results in the rejection, not only of himself, but of his whole background and his parents. Everything else cannot but have a tremendously harmful effect on the child. For this reason I am of the group of folklorists who believe that bilingualism and biculturalism is very important in the minority individuals' search for identity. In search for identity, and in dealing especially with the Mexican-American, certainly part of what the child should be given is something of the background of Mexico and Spain. But, most important is the folk culture. It is the Mexican-American's very own culture that he has developed for a long time.

Dr. Troike spoke about language in this respect: If the child can be made to feel ashamed of the way that he speaks Spanish, so can he be made to feel ashamed of his customs, life style and everything that he stands for. Quite to the contrary, we feel that the use of the child's culture, of the child's folk culture, in the classroom will result in three good effects. One, giving the child a sense of self-respect that his particular background is interesting, that it can be discussed, and it can be given importance. Two, the teacher himself will benefit from learning about the child's background, his folk culture, and will understand his motivations and his attitudes better, and be able to relate with them. If the teacher becomes interested in collecting some of this child's folklore, there will be a much closer relation between teacher and parent. In my experience at least, it seems this has been one of the problems in working with Mexican-American children in school. There appears to be a lack of interest on the part of the parent because of the fact that they don't seem to have as much contact with the teachers as possible. How this folklore may be used in working with minority school children is a problem. There are no textbooks as far as I know on this material. We still have to collect among the specific groups we are dealing with. The ones that are in Spanish are either outdated or do not apply. The folklore texts that they collected in Mexico or other places are very good as background for the teacher, but in many cases it would be a mistake to use them with the children because they are, again, very often in another dialect.

To copy from my colleague here, I have sometimes approached the materials they have been collecting 50, 60 or 100 years ago. The closest thing we would have here, I suppose, is the things that have been collected in Mexican folklore - specifically the Mexican folklore. Interesting enough, the collecting began among Mexican-American groups rather than in Mexico while Mexican scholars were relatively unsophisticated about folklore collecting.

Aurelio Espinoza, Sr., was collecting a good deal of materials here in the United States. In the journal, "American Folklore," let's say around 1908-1920, can be found a great amount on Mexican-American materials. The journal, "American Folklore," at that time had the policy of publishing texts in their original language, which it no longer has, and of course, Espinoza was the linguist.

Many of these things are even transcribed in a phonetic arrangement, as well as in the regular way. So, if you are interested in some background materials, the ones that I do certainly recommend the most are what Espinoza has collected. Juan de Rael, a student of Espinoza, has a very important collection, but only of folktales. "Puerto Español de Nuevo México y Colorado" is the name. Rael includes a number of jokes. Jokes are one of the most important areas in which to measure attitudes and feelings of the people. However, it is sometimes dangerous when you have a joke that you think that particular group has invented and you apply it directly. It is a good idea to know that these jokes have been circulating for sometime.

Bilingual jokes are a very special creation of minority groups and this is another area in which investigations can be very fruitful. The matter of stereotypes, ethnic ties, names that people give to each other or to themselves, is very fruitful a source for the relieving of tensions.

Perhaps the best source for the average teacher would be a very recent book by Jan Brunzand called The Study of American Folklore. It is limited like every other book - he is interested only in Anglo American folklore. By American folklore, he means the folklore of the Anglo Saxon protestants. However, the basic principles of folklore are the same everywhere. There is a different emphasis as far as Brunzand is concerned among different people. His book has an excellent introduction for anyone approaching folklore for the first time and wants to know what the basic principles are, and how to identify them, and how to go about having some idea whether you are dealing with folklore or not.

Allan Dundes has another book called The Study of Folklore, which is a series of essays by migrant workers in the field. Those, I would say, are the two basic books.

I believe that if we are going to approach this particular matter, making it possible for the Mexican-American child to achieve a sense of dignity and self-respect, his own traditions, legends, heroes, sayings, and songs must be taken into account. This is really biculturalism and ties in very closely with the question of bilingualism in our schools.

Speech delivered by Dr. Rudolph Troike, Assoc. Prof.
of English, University of Texas, at San Antonio, Texas.

DIALECTIC EDUCATION

I want to reassure you, in spite of the title on the program, that this will not be a dialectic marxism or something of that sort. Rather, it is to discuss with you the importance of understanding the fundamental nature of language and language variety as it concerns a bilingual education program. Let me begin with a little bit of background on the concept of the nature of language as viewed by a linguist. Language, as a system of communication, is fundamentally and foremost a social institution and, like all social institutions, it undergoes change with time. We accept the idea of change and variation in other aspects of social activities and other aspects of culture. We take these things for granted: the way we dress, the way we wear our hair, the kind of food we eat - these are a normal, natural part of simply living in a society. We accept the notion that these things vary in space, they vary in time, and this is the way things are.

When it comes to language, however, we harbor all sorts of attitudes about the way things should be as opposed to the way they are. We have been taught for a long time to reject the idea that language, like other aspects of culture, may also vary in space and time and that this is a normal and a natural part of language just as it is a normal and natural part of other aspects of culture. The consequences of this are that we tend to take the assumption that the kinds of statements that have been put down in books and various places about language - are the "correct" views about languages. They are the forms that we ourselves should attend to and that we should try, in some manner or other, to impress upon our children. The linguist, on the other hand, takes the very strong viewpoint that the real facts of language, the real forms of language are to be found in the heads of the native speakers of a particular language; that language has its reality, its growth, and its utility in the lives of the people who use the language. Therefore, as all other aspects of culture change, language will also change as time passes. It will come to have different varieties in different parts of the country and different parts of the world as time goes on.

This, in part, is the natural consequences of the way children learn language. If we take a look at the process of language acquisition, the process of learning language on the part of children, we begin to discover how and why these variations take place. We discover how and why, what we call dialects, come about in all languages and we come to a better understanding of our own roll in a bilingual program in the classroom. We are also able to realize the relevance of this information in the preparation of materials and the whole direction and current that we should be taking in the field of bilingual education. To start with every child comes to the task of learning a language - be it English, Spanish, Navajo, or whatever - as if programmed like a computer to learn the language. The child doesn't have any built-in predispositions as to

what the language is like. There is no racial difference, no racial inheritance involved with language learning. Each child comes to the task simply ready to learn whatever language it is that is used around him, and as he grows up he learns part of this language. He goes through a very interesting phase, about two years, of putting together sentences composed of two words. One of the interesting observations about children of this stage is that they seem to be able to use a maximum of two words per sentence and it doesn't seem to matter whether this is a verb or an object, or whether this is a subject and a verb - but they can't say subject, verb,and an object at the same time. They have to break up the sentence and produce it in sequences of two words. Gradually this phase passes, they begin to build up three word sentences. All the while, they are listening to the people around them talking and they are performing something that in the viewpoint of the linguist is really close to a miracle and that is - they are figuring out how the people around them structure the sentences that they produce. How the child does this, we haven't the remotest idea. It is simply one of the miraculous facilities of the human organism that the child is able to do this without any special instruction. The parents don't really sit children down on their knees and say "now Johnny, or José, I want to tell you that we have nouns and verbs in our language and subjects and objects." The child figures this out all by himself. No parent ever takes the child aside and says "now I want to let you in on the fact that we have gender in our languages and these things are suppose to agree - masculine and feminine forms." Somehow or other, just by listening to people talk, the child begins to become aware of these facts and begins to incorporate them into his own use of the language so that gradually, as the child matures, as he listens to people talking, he figures these things out for himself. He forms what we would call an internal theory, a personal theory of the way the language is put together.

Now, consequent to this, is that in real fact, each individual, each one of us here, has a unique theory as to the way our language or languages operate. No two of us speak exactly the same form of language. Now, as the child goes out from his home with this particular unique theory that he has, that has been built up from listening to people, members of the family talking to him, he begins playing with other kids in the neighborhood and each one will come into the interaction situation with his own personal idea of what the language is like and no two of these will be quite the same. The children begin playing together and they begin rubbing off some of the rough edges of their personal theories. Children, as you well know, have a well developed technique for bringing to bear pressure on conformity. Being like the other kids, talking like the other kids, really begins to take precedence to the child over the form that he may hear from his own parents. As much as it may hurt the pride of some parents, it is nevertheless a fact of life that as children in groups play together and talk together they will begin to form particular norms of usage. Particular patterns will develop and this will often be a matter of individual accident. The person in the group that has the strongest right arm might determine which linguistic form is adopted. Since this fellow happens to want to use a certain verb form like <u>yo sabo</u>

and the other kids have learned otherwise, it might not take very long for him to punch this into them. Various other factors may affect their form of speech. The most popular child in the group may affect the attitude as to what forms are developed. Children growing up in different parts of the same city, such as here in San Antonio, will be growing up in different interaction groups, different communicating groups, and a consequence of this is that through time there is a sort of natural drift in the norms of what people will tend to use. If we look in an area that has been settled for a very long period of time, this gradual shift in norms will bring about the creation of what we call dialect.

If you live in an area such as Spain, or an area such as England, where people have been speaking the language for a thousand, two thousand years, you have strongly different local dialects of the language. For example, in Spain itself you find such differences. In one part of the country, a word will be masculine and in another part of the country it will be feminine. In different parts of England you may find people using different pronoun forms, different verb forms, as well as a different pronounciation. In time, it is a common experience that one particular area, one particular center, for purely historical reasons, purely accidental reasons of military importance, social importance, cultural importance and commercial importance, will begin to rise to prominence within a particular linguistic area. As this happens, the people in that area because of the commercial, cultural, and political importance that they, and other people in that area have,come to feel also that their particular speech forms are likewise more prestigious. Now this has nothing to do with the forms themselves. There is really nothing better about saying yo vi instead of yo vide but simply the fact that in one area where the people themselves have greater economic importance and greater political importance will find that their speech forms will come to be considered to have greater prestige. An important thing from the viewpoint of the linquist is that as these things happen, as some speech forms come to have more prestige than others, people will commonly, lacking historical perspective, after all, they don't know what their ancestors spoke a thousand years ago, will come to the conclusion that because a particular speech form is more prestigious - that it must in some sense be the correct form and all of the other forms must be corruptions of that one. A theory like this immediately plays into the hands of the people who speak the favored form. Naturally they would like other people to believe that theirs is the purest form of the language and the psychological toll, of course, that this takes on people who speak other forms is readily to be imagined. This is a common situation if we look into a country like England, we find that back over the century various dialects of the language have had prominence since the fourteenth century. It has been the dialect of London that has been the predominant form in the country. So people today who still, in the back country of England, hang on the the forms that Chaucer, Shakepeare, and King Arthur used, are using the purest form of the language. One can hardly find a purer form of the language than this, yet they find themselves being left out and being told that

their forms of the language are corruptions of the pure form of English which is spoken in London. When we look at the matter, it is an interesting fact that London English is one of the dialects of English found in England that is probably the most changed from the original form of King Arthur, Chaucer, and Shakespeare. This happens over, and over, and over again, that most changes in the language takes place in the large metropolitan centers precisely among educated speakers in the language. Some people have suggested that there is in this something of a flight away from identification with the country people of the lower socio-economic groups. They are striving to establish linguistic forms that will indeed be different and will establish the upper class as a prestige group so that one can, simply by listening to the way a person talks, decide whether he should be invited in the front door or asked to go around to the back door. Whatever the motivations that lead to change of this sort and the maintenance of change, it is nevertheless a fact that very strong social attitudes do come to be attached to these things. Very often the forms of the language which are the oldest and are preserved from earlier periods of the language will be those that are used in the rural areas and used by the less educated members of society. We find this, for example, in English in things like the double negative. King Arthur used double negatives; Chaucer used double negatives; Shakespear used double negatives; then, about 1762, a grammarian came along and said "thou shall not use double negatives." Ever since then, English speakers have been going around with a guilty conscious about this and feeling that because this has been inscribed on the tablets that Moses brought down from the mountain, at least so it seems, that we should all feel guilty if we use double negatives. It was, in fact, simply an invention of a particular grammarian. It was picked up by an upper class group and immediately became one of the passwords whereby you decide who should come in the front door and who should come in the back door. Consequently, millions of speakers of the language who have gorwn up preserving the purity of the language, and trying to use double negatives, come to the first grade classroom and are confronted by the teacher and told this is wrong, that this is bad, and they should be ashamed of doing things like that.

The same sort of thing has faced the Spanish-speaking child who tries to preserve the language of Caesar and who says yo vide instead of yo vi and we remember Caesar's comment when he completed the conquest of Gaul, "I came, I saw, I conquered." The "I saw" is exactly the same historical form as in Spanish vide in this area. Now, what do we do when the Spanish-speaking child comes to school with a form like this? It is not the form that is used in the books. It is the form that educated speakers in Mexico City or Madrid use. We tell the child that it is wrong, he should be ashamed of using a form like this, and that he should try to get rid of it. I think we can see that a real problem arises when we do not understand the nature of language change, the history of our own language, and the kind of social attitudes that this creates; particularly the kind of attitudes that it creates in relation to our teaching and the entire way in which we approach students in the

classroom. It is extremely important for us to recognize the principle that linguist have been trying to make strongly evident for a long time - that is the concept that all forms of the language, whatever they are, whether they are prestige forms or the non-prestige forms, or if you want to call them - the standard dialect forms and non-standard forms, all of these are simply dialects. There is no such thing as a pure language as opposed to dialects. We often hear and read and get the concept that one can speak of pure English or standard English as opposed to dialects of English or one can speak of standard Spanish as opposed to dialects of Spanish. I think we need to recognize that what's called standard English or what is called standard Spanish is itself a dialect - in other words, it is the standard dialect of Spanish. It is essentially the upper class regional dialect that developed around Madrid. The standard English is in fact the upper class educated dialect that developed around London and in southern England in the course of the 17th and 18th centuries and has progressed onto the present time. As soon as we recognize that all forms of the language are dialects, then the notion that we are teaching children something that is different from their own speech form or different from what is considered standard, is, in a sense, erroneous. These notions have to give way to a much more recent understanding of a much more humanistic awareness that, in fact, the dialect they speak is nothing more than a sister dialect of the dialect that we are attempting to indicate in the classroom. I thing this then brings us to a very different attitude toward the language that the child brings to the classroom and our own notions of how we are going to go about approaching the teaching situation. Rather than assuming that his forms are wrong, we must recognize that they are simply parallel forms to the forms we want to teach.

Naturally, we want to teach the student to control the forms of the so called standard dialect because these are the forms that are used most widely in the educated world. They are the forms which occur primarily in the written form of the language and they are the forms of wider communication, so they are important. At the same time, however, his own forms are extremely affect laden for him. They are the medium which he uses for communication in his own group for group identification and association. They are the forms which he has learned from his parents and that his friends use. I think, more than possibly is realized, the teacher succeeds in turning off the child by telling him that these forms are wrong. A real problem for the child, perhaps a "pseudo problem" for the child, is that he feels that he must either identify wholly with the language of the classroom and reject everything else; or, he must reject the language of the classroom and hold on to that which he already holds most dear. I think we implant a very difficult problem for the child when we do this. It is really a false problem because what, in fact, we want to do is not to replace the language that the child brings with him to the classroom. Remember he starts out when he is about two years old learning this language and by the time he comes to us, he has been working very hard at this for some four years learning to master this language. Therefore, what we want to do is add to his repertory and add to the forms that he is able

to master both in his own language and the second language that we are trying to teach him. In this, we can take advantage of the fact that he still has as a very active capacity, this ability to acquire language - this wonderful, miraculous, innate ability that the child is born with. If we present him with adequate opportunities both to hear and use the standard forms without implying any standardization of his own forms, I think we present him with the proper road to travel. It is a road in which he can be kept on language forms and where he can use them where he wants to and use them where they are significant and important to him. At the same time the child can acquire, as a second dialect, the forms of the standard dialect; the forms that he can use in the world outside, and the forms that he can use in communicating with strangers in formal situations and the forms he will encounter in books for reading and for writing.

If we look at the question of dialect in its total perspective; historically and in terms of the way in which the child goes to the language learning experience, we can then take advantage of this knowledge to develop an instructional program which will graduate a child who is much more complete as a user of the language and will not reach the end of his language learning activities with this very deeply ingrained feeling that so many of us have been forced to grow up with. We are, in some sense, having to be false either to ourselves or to others in making choices as to which form of the language we use. In going into a bilingual education program, we often face a teaching situation that involves not just two languages but an education program which very often involves two dialects of each of the languages that we are teaching; the dialect that the child brings to the classroom and the dialect of wider use and wider education. We want to teach him and prepare the child to go on in school - to achieve success in the larger society. In a sense, we have a four-fold task, not only in teaching English as a second language and teaching Spanish as a second language but of teaching standard English as a second dialect and teaching standard Spanish as a second dialect for this kind of program. In preparing materials, we need much more information than we now have about the forms that children use as they are growing up and about forms that are used throughout the area.

In order that the teacher, in a given situation, will be able to properly assess whether the form the child is using is one that he is using simply because he has not quite yet learned enough about the language to have learned the right form, or whether it is a form he is using because this is the form that his friends and his parents use. We need to have a great deal more research done on this. Research is just now beginning to get started in this part of the country.

I was speaking with someone the other day about the problems of trying to implement programs in the area of bilingual education, as it happens in other areas of education, without having been preceded by any period of research. We move first into action programs and then think about research. He commented that education was the only area in which we did this sort of thing. He said that in medicine, nobody would even dream of rushing out to start giving everyone an innoculation for some sort of virus until quite a bit of time had been spent on basic

research - developing these things, testing them out; and as far as funding goes, exactly the same is true. In medicine you have an enormous amount of funding for basic research and the application is based on this. In education it is usually the other way around - so I would like to make a small plea to change this particular aspect of things. Certainly, more spending is needed here.

In closing, I would like to make one very strong statement which does come out of some of the minor research that has been funded (thanks primarily to the Texas Education Agency and some support from the Southwest Educational Lab.); and that is, research into the problems of Spanish language acquisition in this area; Spanish dialects in this area, the nature of contents of these characteristics - particularly of the Spanish spoken in Texas. Probably all of you have heard the majority term Tex-Mex being used. Those of you from New Mexico may have a comparable term out there and some majority term is used to put down the regional dialect and to imply that it is, in fact, some kind of corruption of English and Spanish. There was an article in Time Magazine sometime back which said poor people who live down on the border of South Texas don't have a language. They speak a random mixture of Spanish and English words that just don't have any order. There is no grammer to this, and one must therefore assume that any bilingual program has to begin with the assumption that these people have no language at all, as anybody knows, this is not true.

Donald Lamb from A&M University did a very nice piece of research recently in which all he did was go to a couple of fluent bilingual people and say "I want you to talk about something." They sat down and talked about cooking and there was this wonderful mixture of English and Spanish terms flowing through. Then he said, "I want you to be very careful; I want you to conduct your conversation in Spanish." They talked for awhile just in Spanish, no English at all. "Now", he said, "I want you to conduct your conversation in English." They went on talking in English, using no Spanish words. He said "Okay, don't worry, just start talking," and so they went on - mixing the two together. I think this is a beautiful illustration.

Everyone knows but, as yet, no one has previously documented anything to prove to the doubters that Texas-Spanish, and I'll add New Mexico-Spanish, is perfectly good Spanish ... completely, fully. The decision to use English words is simply a decision the speaker makes on the spur of the moment depending on whatever words he feels more comfortable using for a particular object. It is natural, since Spanish in this area has had more contact with English, that there are a lot more English language terms that have gone into use. This has not made the Spanish of this area any less Spanish than the Spanish of Rio de Janeiro, Madrid, or any other area of the world.

Let us all join the campaign to get rid of the term Tex-Mex. Get rid of the idea that the majority associates with our students - that they don't really speak Spanish, but have a corrupt form of the language. Recognize the fact that the Spanish-speaking child brings with him a very rich linguistic resource that we can use as a basis for education. Thank you!

REACTIONS TO PRESENTATIONS
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Concern was expressed over the lack of information available to teachers, administrators, and educators due to the obvious need for research and development in the field of bilingual education. They expressed a great need to be informed of methods that have been tried and proven effective. There was concern that they might now be using methods, or trying to set up the use of certain methods, that had already been proven obsolete by ineffectiveness. How to go about disseminating methods that other educators and projects might like to know about, and might prove helpful in other areas of endeavor, were widely discussed. It was the conclusion of the group that guidelines, and in particular, guidelines that had been carefully researched and proven, were sadly lacking. One group felt that the meetings that occurred once a month with consultants were not giving them the kind of information they needed, and were not giving it to them fast enough.

The groups agreed that it was very important for the Mexican-American child to have teachers, educators, instructors, aides, and all those involved in bilingual education, to take strongly into account the background of the child. They felt teachers should be more concerned with human values than the amount of material that is supposed to be covered by a certain period of time, as is predisposed for meeting certain standards of educational requirement for certain grade levels. It was felt that adjusting the curriculum or standards was far more important than trying to adjust the child. The ideal teacher, it was felt, would be one that could appreciate the culture of the Mexican-American child, his home background, his economic status and/or conditions, and guide the child with patience and understanding into what he might feel to be a different world. Self-image was agreed to be very important, teaching a child to be proud of his heritage and not ashamed. Because he would be exposed to a different culture, this did not necessarily make it better than his own.

In one session, a question was asked if a conflict of two value systems, Mexican-American and Anglo cultures, would tend to make a person schizophrenic. This question was answered by referring to Dr. Ulibarri's definition of a bilingual-bicultural child. The ideal to strive for--a child who can function with equal dexterity in two languages in the milieu of two cultures. This was, by unanimous agreement, most likely to be achieved through the type of program identified in Dr. Ulibarri's monograph, entitled Administration of Bilingual Education.

Parental involvement and understanding was agreed to be of prime importance. Ways and means of the best ways of doing this were discussed. They wanted the parents not to be suspicious and distrusting out of fear of their leading their children away from them and their standards and beliefs. It was agreed that person-to-person contact was,

by far, the best way to communicate with the parents as a beginning for a more complex program. Discuss with them their own child's particular program and how it would benefit the child. After this first person-to-person contact, other ways could be brought in to involve the parents. Mentioned were scheduling parent-teacher conferences, involving parents in in-service training activity, and using mothers as volunteers. Auditorium programs, plays stressing cultural heritage, was also given as an example of a way to make the parent and the child appreciate and take pride in their cultural heritage. They agreed that home visits were better than having a parent come to the school. The school setting is formal, and often makes them feel inferior and fearful. Teachers need to familiarize themselves with the student's home enviornment. Parents should be made to understand that home visits are not only for problems; in that way, they will come into school regularly and not just for problems. It was recommended that, if parents were not proficient in English, reports to parents should be in Spanish.

Another group's reference point for discussion was the presentation of Dr. Ulibarri's presentation on Behavioral Objectives, and concluded that a behavioral objective was a statement of what we would like the child to do or accomplish educationally in his interaction with other people. It was the concensus of the group that situations, in which a student successfully parrots a pre-determined statement about himself, were not a measure of improved self concept. The group also discussed briefly the advisability of setting behavioral objectives for administrators, teachers and teachers aides.

Mr. Cruz-Aedos' call for a democratic approach to in-service training was endorsed. There was some comment to the effect that such a democratic process in administrators, teachers, and teacher aides relations would reflect the concept of recognizing the individuals' inherent values, as expressed by Dr. Ulibarri, and might filter down to the classroom an acceptance of the individual child's inherent values. In reaction to Mr. Aedos' presentation, "In-Service Presentation," the group discussed the use of teacher aides, and the way of utilizing aides. They agreed that the requirements for aides should be flexible to meet the needs of the community. However, it was felt that the roles for the aide need to be clear cut in each situation to provide better service to the teacher and the children, and promote a harmonious setting. They agreed that aides should have more training in small group work, audio visual, machine operation, preparation of material, clerical duties, and individual aide to students. The role will vary depending on the community, level of instruction, and purpose.

It was also in general agreement that colleges should take the responsibility to train the many, many teachers they are "turning out" every year to deal with the teaching of minority group children. This is the logical first step. The certified teachers, who are now teaching in bilingual programs, should attend concentrated workshops, and get college credit for these endeavors. There should be a continuous education program for bilingual teachers. Pressures need to be brought

to bear on the colleges and universities to provide requirements and courses for such programs in order to meet the supply and demand of bilingual education. The state should also be held responsible to show the colleges and universities that the educators are determined to keep bilingual education in their curricula, and the colleges must establish a department in this area. The groups recommended closer cooperation between the state education agency, and listed as top priority the implementation of a training program for teachers involved in bilingual programs. This training to include: (1) training in the development of materials, (2) training in sensitivity, and (3) training in the use and implementation of materials. It was agreed that Dr. Troike's speech was an excellent vehicle to enable one to take more pride in his particular manner of speaking. The group stated they would like to have institutes for enrichment for teachers in applied linguistics and anthropology. The courses should also be "credit" courses so more teachers will be attracted to these institutes. It was felt that teachers do need to know the forms of the child's language. Standardized tests do not account for dialectic variations, and teachers need to be prepared to accept substitute forms. Tests need not be developed on regional basis or norms. There is need for simple instruments for linguistic analysis--reading readiness, language dominance, and content words. In the area of oral language development, it was thought that dictating stories and learning to read the stories would be a way of getting close to a child's vocabulary variation and norms. Riddles and jokes were another example. Most important was the acceptance of dialect and concept of dialect, and concept of correctness.

The discussion on attitudinal changes was to stress that we must be aware that we are living in an age and time where things move at a fantastic rate of speed. In order to survive, we must adapt ourselves to these rapid changes, and the educational world must make the proper changes to meet these challenges. Some of the changes involved attitude, and this means that those engaged in education must have a receptive and tolerant attitude when innovation, new ideas, and methods in education are brought about. The attitude of the teacher will determine, to a large extent, the success or failure of any project. Therefore, attitudes become of vital importance in the educational world. An important point was brought out that the new teachers, or teachers who have taught only a short time, adapt themselves better to the bilingual program than teachers who have taught a long time.

It was agreed that Mr. Cantu's presentation, "Community Involvement Through the Effective Use of Mass Media Communication," was accepted as essential to a successful program. The need was recognized for total community support through a planned communication effort. Also, all informative materials should recognize the language of the groups to whom the publicity is directed. It was thought important to thoroughly acquaint all members of the educational group, as well as the parents, with the importance of having their program accepted by the public, and for them to understand and be able to relate these facts to the layman. Newsletters in Spanish and English would include parent involvement in

in the programs. Promotion of a project through parent awareness on a person-to-person basis was thought to be an excellent way of getting an intended program started. Also discussed, as ways of communication, were Regional Service Centers, Parents Council, social workers, or visiting teachers, and teacher aides.

The group's reactions to Dr. Américo Paredes' talk on folklore was to discuss the ways folklore could be developed as part of their curricula. The administrator's role of a supportive nature was suggested as of prime importance. It was thought he should also aid the teachers in curriculum development in coordinating folklore into the curriculum and dialectic studies. It was brought out that folklore is gradually disappearing in the urban areas, and to a great extent in the rural areas. Bringing in people from the community, parents and especially elderly people, was a point discussed in how folklore could be brought into the classrooms. It was agreed that folklore is an intregal part of bilingual education, and more should be done to explore the possibility of getting professional guidance in this area. Colleges might be excellent sources. College students interested and capable in this field might be given the opportunity to try their skill in the classroom. Border communities should look into the possibility of using people from Mexico who can share their folklore "knowledge and know-how." Arrangements might be made, whereby schoolchildren might visit some schools in Mexico where folklore presentations are being produced. Folklore in bilingual education was thought to be an excellent way to bridge the gap between home and school, to bring better rapport, and relate to school environment. Changes in attitudes and feelings, as a result of sharing folklore, were discussed. It was thought a program should teach a mutual respect for each cultural heritage. Sharing Spanish songs, games, and rhymes with monolingual teachers, and seeking their help with the bilingual teacher's resources, might help to promote an attitude change within the school.

The Mexican-American's own heroes, own traditions, must be taken into account to give the Mexican-Americans a greater sense of dignity--this ties to bilingualism-biculturalism.

LOS ANGELES CONFERENCE

The Department of Education, State of California, organized and conducted the Bilingual Research Conference held in Los Angeles (Monte Corona), California, December 19-21, 1969. The format of this conference was as follows:

Friday, December 19
Afternoon

REGISTRATION
Receipt of symposium materials and Arrangement of Project Displays

Project Directors
Selection of group leaders

Saturday, December 20
Morning

REGISTRATION

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Daniel C. Reyes, Consultant, Bilingual Education
California State Department of Education

Introduction of Guests and Introductory Remarks

SOCIO-CULTURE AND BILINGUALISM
Dr. Horacio Ulibarri, Director, Bilingual Research Project
University of New Mexico

GROUP SESSION "A"

Group Tasks
#1 - Interpersonal Reaction to the Preceding Presentations
#2 - Implications for Successful Project Operation
#3 - Preparation of group report

Afternoon

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Post Meeting Feedback - Presentation of Group Reports
Outline of group report to be filed with Symposium Chairman

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT THROUGH THE EFFECTIVE USE OF MASS MEDIA COMMUNICATION
Mr. Mike Cantu, Coordinator of Communications
Education Service Center, Region 20, San Antonio, Texas

GROUP SESSION "B"

Group Tasks
#1 - Interpersonal reaction to the preceding presentations in Accordance with Assigned Points of View
#2 - Implications for Successful Project Operation
#3 - Preparation of Group Report

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Post Meeting Feedback - Presentation of Group Reports
Outline of Group Report to be filed with Symposium Chairman

PANEL DISCUSSION OF CURRENT PROBLEMS IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND OPERATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROJECTS AND PLANNING FOR CONTINUATION

Chairman - Paul Juarez, Director, Chula Vista Title VII ESEA Bilingual-Bicultural Education Project

Members - Vincent Bello, Teacher, Fountain Valley
Armando Cisneros, Teacher, Downey Unified School District

Eduardo Garza Snyder, Instructor, Chapman College

Ben Soria, Project Director, Title VII ESEA, Santa Ana School District

(Expertise in system design. Question and answer period to follow).

Sunday, December 21
Morning

Project Directors, Teachers, Assistant Instructors, and others will meet in separate groups to discuss current problems.

WHAT'S THE SCORE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION
Anthony (Tony) Sierra, President, Board of Trustees, Calexico Unified School District

INDIVIDUAL REPORTS
Prepared Resolutions

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

RECAPITULATION OF SYMPOSIUM ACTIVITIES AND EVALUATION
Dr. Robert Yeaton, Educational Consultant, Yeaton Consulting Services

SPEECHES: LOS ANGELES CONFERENCE

1. SOCIO-CULTURE AND BILINGUALISM, Dr. Horacio Ulibarri
   This speech printed in the San Antonio Section and is not reproduced in this section.

2. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT THROUGH EFFECTIVE USE OF MASS MEDIA COMMUNICATION, Mr. Michael J. Cantu
   This speech printed in the San Antonio Section and is not reproduced in this section.

3. Dr. Eugene Gonzales, State of California, Department of Education, had prepared a speech entitled BILINGUAL EDUCATION: A TROJAN HORSE. However, because of unforseen circumstances, he was unable to present this discussion and, instead, extemporaneously praised the teachers of California involved in Bilingual education.

4. A panel discussion, led by Mr. Paul Juarez, discussed the problems involved in establishing educational objectives. It related educational objectives to evaluation emphasizing the need to behavioralize these objectives in order to be able to measure outcomes adequately. The whole question of stating objectives in terms of behavioral outcomes and the process of measuring these outcomes related to bilingual education and program development.

Delivered by Tony N. Sierra
Los Angles, California

WHAT'S THE SCORE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Bien Venidos a esta importante conferencia...

I wish that I could come before you this morning in the traditional spirit of the American speaker. I wish that I could begin here by cracking a few jokes. I wish that I could begin by setting up a mellow tone, by livening up the atmosphere. I wish that I could "Set you up," so to speak...but I have to be candid with you and let you know at the outset that I consider your work, your challenge, and the item of bilingual education too serious--too damned important for lively comic-routine approach. Our students are too precious to joke and kid about.

I won't approach the topic of bilingual education and your involvement in it from an educator's standpoint. I won't attempt to discuss methods, materials or curriculum. I am not prepared or trained in that--you are supposed to know all those things already.

I will, however, very bluntly and very clearly, attempt to say to you what I as a school board member, what I as a concerned American, and, most important, what I as a parent of Mexican-American children see developing, and, the intuitive feeling that I get when I look around California and see our bilingual programs. When I listen around I hear many of you discuss your particular work in this field and what a terrific job you think you are doing.

To begin with, I have to tell you that since some years back, I am and I'm sure many others are too, very deeply concerned with the multitude of problems that beset our students...I am concerned with all the traditional obstacles and dead end tunnels that we as a group have to face in our educational system. I won't insult your intelligence by wasting your time listing all the things that I consider are wrong, or by delving into statistics...most of you know all these things better than I do. In fact some of you wrote the book! Having this concern then, I was one of the early believers, one of the early promoters of bilingual education. I did everything in my power to make this program a reality in our country and in our state, California. I had faith in this apparently wonderful tool for helping alleviate some of our frustration. Now that I look back on it all, I see that I was innocently, naively, blindly, overly optimistic. On the surface the snow was beautiful but I has no idea how deep and mysterious it was underneath.

At the beginning of our Title VII involvement I felt, as did many others--including the Federal Government, the U.S. Office of Education and our own Department of Education--that if we could get reasonably adequate funding, if we could get reasonable cooperation from local

school districts, if we could get intelligent, aggressive Chicano educators, such as you people, to head up the majority of these programs, if we could work with that wonderful segment of our Anglo educators who are always with us--well, with all these things going for us, in addition to the enthusiasm that most of us have felt, I felt that this time we really had something going. Now we were going to live "high on the hog." Now at long last we had the chance to show what we so-called Chicano leaders could do.

Most of us in this room have heard ourselves talk to each other about how we never got the opportunity to demonstrate what we could do; most of us have for too long waited for the chance to step-up in the educational profession. Most of us have frustratingly longed for something that we could claim as our own baby--our own creation. We longed for some effort to make a big dent in the Chicano Educational Obstacle Course!

Boy, was I naive! I never dreamt that I would ever feel so disenchanted, so disappointed, so despondent about this great effort.

Well, let us take a cursory look at what has happened since the birth of bilingual education in California. What has caused me to become so critical, so teed off at the way we have handled our dear little program...WHERE DID THAT GREAT LOVE DISAPPEAR TO? At this point I want you to know that I am speaking strictly from one person's observation, I speak for no one else but myself, I have no data, I have no evaluations, I have no proof...I come here to give you my feelings and this is the extent of what I am doing.

I would be a fool and a liar if I said anything but the truth as I observe and as I feel. Okay, then what have we done with the programs? First, I have the distinct feeling that many of us weren't truly interested in being genuine crusaders for the Mexican-American student, who so desperately needs our talent. What we really wanted was a title of some sort...we wanted our own office with some sexy brown-eyed secretary...we were too dearly interested in the $15,000, the $18,000 or whatever thousands the position paid. We might, in passing, simulate some extra effort on behalf of our bilingual program; but seldom the untiring dedication that this enterprise calls for, and must have to succeed. Most of the proposals have been written in elaborate and extensive workshops, and with elaborate tools of preparation for our teachers who were to work in these programs. Some of us were charged with the responsibility of developing innovative teaching practices, team teaching, ungraded groups, lab packages and so forth. Did we live up to these committments? Frankly, fellows and ladies, I haven't seen these. Have you? Many of our programs at the classroom level just kind of halfway attend to these details, just enough to satisfy the auditors, both financial and educational. What about the materials you were charged to develop? There may be some, but here again, I get the feeling that many of us are using the same old books that have traditionally been used to teach Spanish in our schools with an occasional import from

Mexico or Spain sneaked in for variety and show! Many of us latched on to some tape in very elementary Spanish that some other fellow cut before he left the district and long before the inception of your bilingual program.

Have we honestly made great efforts to customize the curriculum to meet our needs or to meet the audit?

Again the feeling is there that all we did was to turn loose some ill-prepared teacher in the classroom whose only justification for being there was the fact that she spoke or understood a little Spanish. No extra preparation--no effective workshop--no new materials--no dramatic change in the curriculum, and no extra dedication. There is just enough of all these to satisfy the audit and to prepare for next year's new proposal, maybe bigger but not much better.

Stop for one moment and reflect on what I am saying, am I on somewhat the right track or am I clearly off base? Is there any truth to the rumors that I hear that say that some of our more affluent parents, both Mexican-American and Anglos, are becoming concerned about the inability of the bilingual classes to show them any marked improvement in the language ability of their children? Are some of them saying that the student is better off in some other academic class, that he should be transferred out of the bilingual class and quit wasting his time...? Are some of the local school administrators becoming disgruntled because the bilingual programs with these shortcomings are causing more trouble than they are worth? Is the red tape involved in federal funding too overwhelming when these programs derived cannot be near 100% effective and justified? Are some local school districts carrying on the bilingual programs more because they fear political repercussion from their Mexican-American community than because they are real assests to their children and truly successful?

Has all this beautiful opportunity with the fantastic hopes that we had...has it become just another link in the old standard school establishment that so many of us have forever questioned and critized?

I don't know the answers to all these questions, maybe no one knows, but it is my feeling that we had better do some searching...some critical searching and either prove or disprove what I have stated.

I want you to know that I realize I am talking in very general generalities. I realize also that maybe one year is not enough time to expect these things I look for in bilingual education. In addition, I realize that somewhere there must be programs and directors and teachers who are doing a fantastic job, who have the dedication and the preparation far beyond what is written into the proposals. Let's hope you yourself feel that you are one of these and that I am talking about some other fellow in some other school district 500 miles from you!!!

One more important point to consider, recall that we are now living

in the new era of program budgeting, accountability, goals, objectives and evaluations...how will these items apply to your particular program? Are all of us able to present, in good conscience, evidence that we have complied with our promise in these areas? Not only for the sake of the audits and refunding possibilities, but of far greater importance because they reflect directly on what our children are getting from us, the so-called leaders of the Mexican-American community. I hope we collectively are not helping to give our students the dirty end of the stick again!!!

A thought just came to my mind...I think that if the bilingual programs were an animate thing, if they could talk, they would probably tell us what the innocent little Mexican girl told her blonde blue-eyed lover... she said and I quote her, "YOU DON'T KISS ME BECAUSE YOU LOVE ME, YOU KISS ME BECAUSE YOU WANT TO DO ME SOMETHING." Are you trying to do something to the programs...and the children...?

If I have offended any of you I apologize. I am sorry I couldn't offer you a scholarly presentation, but I honestly felt that we need to think about these things that I have briefly touched on. I think that when the people who control the purse strings in Washington and in Sacramento look to you and me for bilingual education justification they are going to think about these things!!!

Soon we are going to face the matter of trying to obtain an increase in funding for our Title VII. We must work positively together and police ourselves so that we can somehow or other work to show clearly and effectively that when we ask for 10 million or whatever millions of dollars we ask for...that we know what we are doing with the money. That we propose to deliver a dollar's worth for every dollar spent. These considerations are important, but of infinitely greater importance is that I am, and I hope you are too, through with being satisfied in serving our Mexican-American students with anything less than a 100% effort in their education... No ifs,..no buts...no maybes!!!

REACTIONS TO PRESENTATIONS AT LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA

In reacting to the speeches given at the Monte Corona Bilingual Education Symposium, the groups discussed a wide variety of topics relating to their interpretations of the speeches. The various topics provided information relevant to every participants' interest and field.

The primary concerns of the participants in reaction to the presentations involved questions of principles supporting the teaching of bilingual education, attempts at bringing the programs to the parents and the community, the challenges of the program, the basic concept of bilingualism, and the ramifications of the bilingual program. Other topics discussed in reaction to the presentations were the use of materials, need for a communication and information dissemination network, utilization of research data, and a closer working relationship between the state education office, the various on-going projects, the schools, and the community. Stress was also placed on developing lines of communication between the administrators, the teachers, the teacher aides, the project directors, and the community. In each group the frustration due to unsatisfactory communication was evident.

The idea of establishing communication was the theme interwoven throughout all of the group's discussions. A need for sharing materials and ideas was fervently expressed and a knowledge of the names of people heading the various projects and their staffs was cited as important.

One group discussed the idea of the "pull-out" system. Here the student is taken out of the class one period a day for the purpose of providing him with an enrichment program in his native language. Caution was exercised in creating a sense that the child was being given a "boost" rather than being given remedial education. The question of segregation arose concerning the use of the 'pull-out" system. The participants explained that this program included Anglo students who were interested in learning Spanish (or the language being taught), and were encouraged to attend this class. Also, in some programs "gifted" students were included in the total program so that the other students would not feel they were having to take a compensatory education or remedial education program. The primary concern in this discussion centered around the child's self concept. Of paramount importance was the child's perception of himself in relation to the total program.

One group discussed a statement that Dr. Gonzales had made referring to the use of materials: "Materials are less important than finding new ways of structuring education." In dealing with this discussion, the group realized that the materials provide only a means to an end--the materials <u>per se</u> are never going to solve the problems in bilingual education. They handled this point in terms of looking at the relevancy of the materials in relation to the goals of their individual programs and relating those elements essential to the objectives of the program. Learning styles and strategies entered into the discussion as well as

the pace and purpose the students learn by and for. There was general agreement that new ways of handling the educational process for bilingual education may indeed be a key to providing and planning more successful programs.

General to the discussions and reactions was the idea that we need to make the bilingual programs represent a positive experience rather than a negative one. In this discussion the participants felt strongly that none of their programs were of a remedial nature. It was suggested that one way of embellishing their programs was to use the bilingual student in a tutorial relationship--that is, have the bilingual act as a tutor for another child either at a lower degree of bilingualism or a monolingual child wanting to learn the native language of the bilingual.

The role of the State Department of Education, the United States Office of Education and the education schools or colleges was discussed. There was no sense among the participants that these three agencies shared much in common. They felt that universities and colleges could provide much stronger programs dealing specifically with bilingual orientation. Many pointed out that these institutions can relate what has happened in the research area of education and provide these teachers with better methods. Some felt the universities were a key to much of the failure of bilingual programs in that no continuing programs for refresher training, training of teacher aides, and program development exist. There was general consensus that the State Department of Education was attempting to bridge some of the communication gaps existing between the local and state agencies.

There was hope expressed that bilingual education projects could be made effective enough to provide a rich environment which would intimately acquaint every American child with the richness of more than one culture. There is a primary need, it was felt, for Mexican-American educators to develop these effective programs utilizing all available resources, especially the potential contributions of parents and the community. At the same time, there was fear by some that private industry would dominate the production of software and in some fashion negatively affect bilingual education. However, other participants expressed the need for accurate and imaginative learning materials from varied sources. Competition from private sources might be a stimulus to producing such materials, but there would be need for knowledgeable critics to evaluate these materials. Someone, for example, would have to determine if the materials contained insights which would achieve objectives in the affective domain since cognitive learning alone is judged not to be sufficient for achieving the aims of bilingual education.

Community involvement was a topic which provided the sharing of many ideas between the participants. All of the participants strongly suggested that community involvement was of key importance in their programs. Parents, for example, can provide many special skills and

talents necessary in the bilingual program. They have a wealth of knowledge involved in cultural heritage, i.e., songs, stories, folklore, and artistic talents. Several of the participants pointed out that parents could be used to help translate Spanish stories into flannel board characters so the picture stories could be presented to the children. Many of the participants pointed out they had regular visits to their students' families. These participants spoke of the warmth and welcome they received, and the enjoyment they shared in having a meal with the family. Too many of the participants pointed out that usually a visit to the family was not pleasant because the school officials were having to bear bad news about the child's attitude, lack of performance, attendance problems, and the like. These participants stressed the need for positive working relationships between the school and family.

The need for active parental and community participation in planning all aspects of the school's program was stressed. Parental rejection at bilingual education could be averted if the parents were fully oriented to the aims of the program and given the opportunity to take part in the program's evaluation. The possibility of having parents and significant others play a key guidance role was also offered. For example, through orientation by the school the parents would know considerably more about such things as occupational opportunities developing for their children in our fast-changing economy. With such knowledge they could assist their children in making wise decisions concerning life goals and the training necessary to achieve them. Because of the potential benefit parents and other community adults can offer to their schoolchildren, it was felt that educators, including Mexican-American teachers, should not attempt to monopolize educational decision making.

The use of bilingual teacher aides was also viewed as a highly significant factor in the success of many Title VII programs. There is a pressing need to train more bilingual teacher aides and to guide many of them toward full professional status as teachers. Presently they are proving invaluable because of their ability to relate to Spanish speaking parents, and to provide the parents with a meaningful picture of the child's progress and needs in the school. They are also proving highly instrumental in obtaining increased parental and community participation in school programs.

With respect to the role of project directors, several suggestions were given. They should not, for example, paint too rosy a picture of their respective programs. There will be some failures in bilingual education, given its new and experimental stage. This is to be expected, yet it will afford educators an opportunity to profit from unintended or unavoidable oversights, and to build stronger programs based upon instructive experience.

Project directors should also make certain that monies allocated for bilingual education are being spent for this purpose., rather than

being shunted to other parts of the instructional program. At the same time it is incumbent upon directors to promote the concept of bilingual education throughout their district. Too often, the group suggested, there is mere lip service to the idea of bilingual education on the part of some districts, and English-as-a-second-language programs are used with the intent of obviating the need for a truly bilingual education program. In contrast to English-as-a-second-language programs, bilingual education does not merely seek facility in English; its intent is the development of biculturality through bilingualism.

The crucial element in determining the success of Title VII projects was felt to be the attitude of all the teachers in the district toward bilingual education. There is a strong need to orient the non Mexican-American teacher, for example, to the richness and diversity of the Mexican-American culture. It was suggested that at the present time too many teachers have stereotype notions of the Mexican-American. Also, there appeared to be a difference between older teachers and newer teachers in their attitudes toward Mexican-American students and their problems. Too many older teachers, it was suggested, discourage newer teachers from an optimistic stance when they claim that their longer experience leads them to deduce pessimistic views concerning the abilities and future success of Mexican-American students. The heavy burden of changing these attitudes appears to lie with the new Title VII project directors, but the need to convince administrators, board of education members and other influential people to assist in changing teacher attitudes was recognized.

In many of the reactions, the participants related their basic philosophies referring to the teaching of two languages concomitantly. It was interesting to note that most of the participants felt that the Anglo students should learn, if they chose, the culture and language of the bilingual subjects. In most cases the philosophy expressed in regard to the whole scope of the bilingual program dealt with embellishing the child's concepts of himself, his role in the school community, and his awareness of his own culture and language. Basic to this idea was the desire to make the bilingual child proud to be an American--proud because he has a fine heritage and proud because he lives in a country that preserves his right to pursue educational attainment in the best way he knows. A striking dichotomy existed between the hopes and aspirations the participants felt and what they could actually accomplish because of time limitations, inadequate materials, and insufficient communication.

The challenges of the program centered around a variety of topics. Some believed that the real challenge was "we have the opportunity to research and develop our own materials." The participants in this group reacted to that statement by expressing their need to handle research strategies. Others reacted to the statement in terms of their own inability (because of time, lack of funds, and the like) to develop materials. Teacher aides, it was suggested, could be quite helpful in this area. Other challenges of the program were discussed in obtaining some

kind of feedback on the successfulness of the program. Behavioral objectives were discussed at length because the participants felt these objectives were the most immediate and successful methods of looking at the program.

Throughout the discussions the concept of bilingualism was discussed. Some participants seemed to apologize because they were not bilingual, yet these same participants spoke of visiting the home and conversing in the native language of the family as opposed to English. The degree of bilingualism within the participants varied greatly. Just how "bilingual" the programs were going to make the children was discussed. In dealing with older students, some of the participants pointed out that the purpose was to give the students a dual language utility--when and how one language is used as opposed to the use of the other language. Some of the participants pointed out the caution that must be used in pacing the learning experiences. They felt that we sometimes become "over ambitious" or "over zealous" in our desire to help the students find their role. We must not, they felt, "rush" into the program at a rate too fast for the skills and strategies the student has brought with him. A general consensus was that the bilingual child does learn differently because he is attempting to deal with himself in relation to two cultures.

The various teaching methods were also referred to. Some of the participants were confused about the effectiveness of the Teaching English as a Second Language programs and others expressed their frustrations due to the limitations of such programs. It was decided that no one program or method will meet the explicit needs of any other program, and the teacher's responsibility is to fit the programs and materials to his own program needs. What approach works best with that particular group seemed to be a key question. The participants from the Northern part of the state deal with a different type of bilingual than do those teachers in the Southern part. All of the teachers and participants felt their job was not to just present the second language or embellish the child's native language, but primarily their purpose was to give him the advantages of utilizing two cultures.

A final issue, and certainly as important as the others, centered around whether the teacher needs to be a bilingual himself, or whether an "Anglo" teacher could do the job as well. Some of the participants believed that only a teacher with the same cultural and linguistic background of the children could really understand and handle the task. Others pointed out that there are many "bilingual" teachers who reflect the negativism and disappointment of the failure they experienced in becoming acculturated. This negativism can seriously impede the successfulness of the program. Empathy, understanding, and earnest concern for the growth and development of the child were considered to be the most necessary teacher traits. If a teacher possessed these traits (along with knowledge of both the culture and language of the child) it seemed to make no difference if he were Anglo or bilingual. Even after this consensus, some felt that "we should get that Anglo teacher out of the classroom--he means well, but..."

In discussing the role of classroom teachers it was also pointed out that there are some Mexican-American teachers who do not desire to teach Mexican-American children, merely because they are teachers of Mexican descent. The views of these teachers should be respected, and it should be recognized that they may be making a significant contribution to better human relations while working in schools with a predominantly Anglo-American population.

It was also noted that, in the past, too often the emphasis has been placed upon the Mexican-American student and his family having "a cultural-educational problem." What is now required is to emphasize the fact that the problem does not reside solely with the Mexican-American, but that it is the teacher's obligation to solve the problem of better relating to bilingual students and providing more effective instruction. It is the teacher, after all, who has been charged with the responsibility of educating the child. The parents and others may assist, but the teacher is obligated to achieve results.

In assisting the teacher to solve the porblem of more effective instruction for bilingual students, the colleges were judged to be non focusing on the need for preparing teachers to cope with the unique aspects of teaching bilingual children. The pace is slow, but hopefully the quality of collegiate programs, such as Teacher Corps. Cal State, L.A. Project Maestro, and Claremont's teacher intern project in the barrios will function as exemplary programs for other teacher training programs.

In reacting to Dr. Ulibarri's presentation one group showed concern over the various labels currently in use to identify persons of Mexican lineage. They concluded that there are varied preferences among different persons for terms used to describe their ancestry such as, "Mexican-American," "Chicano," "Mexican," "Latin-American," "Spanish-American," and "American of Mexican Descent." However, some persons of Mexican descent subscribe to none of these terms, and prefer simply to be called "American." In particular there was no agreement concerning the exact meaning or the origin of the term "Chicano." It was noted that this term seems to be the preferred label for the younger activists who claim Mexican ancestry. It was also feared by some participants that some who used this term were claiming 100% Mexicanism to secure undue recognition, position, and power over the less active mass of Mexican-Americans. They feared that the claim, "the Mexican-American community needs and demands this action," would confer unquestioned authority on these "Super Chicanos."

There was also felt to be a difference in the individual's self concept and subsequent self label according to whether the individual is an immigrant from Mexico or born in the United States. Such factors as recency of arrival, age, place of residence, educational attainment, experiences with racial discrimination, occupation and the type of friends and relatives in his social circle were felt to have an important bearing on his self concept and the term he preferred applied to him as a label of identification.

Debate concerning the degree of assimilation being experienced by persons of Mexican descent was carried on with great interest by one group. Some participants feared that assimilation meant alienation from their Mexican cultural roots. All agreed that it was necessary to create a school environment in which the individual child can become aware of the differences between Mexican and Anglo-American culture, so that he can make a rational choice concerning alternative cultural values and customs.

ARIZONA - NEW MEXICO CONFERENCE
ALBUQUERQUE

The New Mexico State Department of Education organized the Bilingual Research Conference held in Albuquerque, New Mexico, February 20-21. The format of this conference was as follows:

Friday, February 20
Morning
REGISTRATION

GENERAL SESSION
Welcome - Henry Pascual, New Mexico State Dept. of Education
Dean Richard Lawrence, College of Education, University of New Mexico

Conference Format - Dr. James Cooper, University of New Mex.

"Socioculture and Bilingualism" - Dr. Horacio Ulibarri

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS: Discussion and reactions to above address

GENERAL SESSION
Group reports of discussion and reactions

Afternoon

GENERAL SESSION
On-Going Bilingual Education Programs
(Ten minute presentations by Project Directors of Individual Projects)

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS: Discussions and reactions to above; Characteristics of a "Good" Bilingual Education Program

GENERAL SESSION
Group reports of small group discussions

Evening

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS: Problems involved in bilingual education

Saturday, February 21
Morning

SMALL GROUP SESSIONS: Problems and Solutions in Bilingual Education

GENERAL SESSION
Reports from Individual Projects
Evaluation of Conference - Final Remarks

Albuquerque Conference

SOCIOCULTURE AND BILINGUALISM

Horacio Ulibarri

This speech is printed in the San Antonio Section and is not reproduced here.

The Coronado School Bilingual Program
At Albuquerque, New Mexico

Reported by Carlos Saavedra

At Coronado School, we are teaching in both languages, and have a three track program. To the first track, we are teaching Spanish to children whose primary language is Spanish, and teach English as a second language. The second track are children that have some knowledge of both languages, but no language base for either. Here, we teach both languages as a second language. We are attempting many things with this group because we must not only overcome the language barrier, but are dealing with the culture of poverty. We feel very strongly, at this point, that these children will learn more in this direction because we cover concepts in the language they are more comfortable in, and reinforce it in the second language. The thrid track is taught to children whose primary language is English, and Spanish is taught as a second language. We are trying to build the child's self concept in both languages, utilizing the Bassells-Palomares Human Development Program for this purpose. Through this program, we hope to strengthen the child's image of himself, and accept himself for what he is. We hope to build on this aspect and, at the same time, foster a deep respect for others.

We feel that we have had some problems because there is an immense lack of materials for this type of teaching. We are attempting to develop and adapt materials as the program progresses. We have written many units in Social Studies, Science, and Reading in Spanish. Another weakness is the lack of preparation of teachers to teach in the bilingual realm. We have an on-going, in-service training program for teachers under the direction of the Project Director and Dr. Dolores Gonzales, from the University of New Mexico. The purpose of this program is to strengthen the teachers' teaching abilities, and teach them new and improved techniques for teaching children who have language difficulties and are primarily from the culture of poverty.

At present, our program includes only five year olds at the kindergarten level, and six year olds in the first grade level. At the kindergarten level, we utilize an oral language and experience approach. We have high hopes that we will be able to take them through a reading readiness program before the year is over. At the first grade level this year, we are utilizing very much the same approach used in kindergarten to build their experience and vocabulary backgrounds. After this first year, we hope to begin a reading program in Spanish at the first grade level because next year the child in first grade will have had a wealth of experiences at the kindergarten level. There are many good things that could develop from this project. Our primary involvement has been most successful, and as the program develops we hope to have full community participation.

Along with the present program at Coronado School, we have an adult basic education project in progress. Two nights a week, we teach Basic English, Basic Math, Reading Improvement, and English-as-a-second language, with approximately 110 adults within the community participating.

ESPANOLA BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Bilingual Education came about when it was determined that a child who did not speak English would immediately fall behind as he entered the typical American school. Furthermore, his language barrier kept him from learning in all subjects taught in English. Needless to say, this also caused the child to reject his own language and in some cases his entire culture.

The techniques then, in Bilingual Education, are designed to permit the use of the child's home language so that he can relate to the instruction and be able to learn concepts while the English language is more gradually introduced. The Espanola project goes a step further; recognizing the cultural diversity of our area, Spanish is taught as a foreign or second language to the English speaking child as well as providing for the teaching of English as a second language to the non-speakers. The learning of each other's language and culture hopefully will result in better understanding and mutual respect among the different ethnic groups in our Valley. It is felt that bilingualism can be more easily attained very early in life and for this reason our program begins with the child's first year in school.

Project Beginnings:

The project was funded in May 1969 as a result of Title VII ESEA appropriations for Bilingual Education. The Espanola project is one of five in the State of New Mexico. It is a demonstration project involving two first grade classes with three teachers in a team-teaching environment. The plan is to increase the classes in succeeding years, adding about eight more classes in 1970-71 in at least two of our elementary schools.

General Objectives:

1. To teach Language Arts and Social Studies in Spanish and English to insure that every child has a familiar medium for learning.
2. To present English as a second language to the non-English speakers.
3. To offer Spanish as a second language to English-speaking children.
4. To create bicultural activities in both groups to allow the children to function more effectively in a bicultural environment.
5. To demonstrate that education, when presented bilingually, is more relevant and comprehensible to the children in our district.

The program utilizes materials in many forms. Along with the readiness and supplementary materials, audio-visual aids, and equipment are used.

Staff:

The personnel directly involved with the program are:

1. Two Instructional Aides, one in each of the demonstration rooms.
2. Three teachers--one teacher specializes in teaching the Spanish component with all the children. The other two teachers also departmentalize their instruction and all three teachers are involved in a team-teaching approach. This allows them to plan together, specialize in selected areas, and present their lessons in a most effective manner.
3. One Assistant Director who spends about 40% of his time with the project and is the fiscal administrator and liaison between the classes, administration, and community.
4. One Director who allocates 5% of his time to supervising the program's planning, implementation, evaluation and dissemination activities.

By employing consultants periodically and in a preschool workshop the staff has been receiving additional instruction for implementing this bilingual approach to education.

Along with the constant ongoing evaluation which takes place internally, the program is also officially evaluated by two State Department officials whose findings are a matter of public record. Further, all Title VII projects also have a commitment to the United States Office of Education to contract with an independent educational accomplishment auditor. The auditor will verify whether or not the program is achieving its objectives and learning is taking place in relation to the funds invested. This new concept of accountability is a definite contribution to the project and will virtually assure that the final outcome will reveal success.

SOUTHEASTERN NEW MEXICO BILINGUAL PROGRAM
Artesia Public Schools

Six public school districts and an institution of higher learning will cooperate in implementing a primary grade bilingual program in the lower Pecos Valley of New Mexico. The initial two-year development phase will be conducted in Artesia, with subsequent operations diversification into the remaining communities.

The project will develop a functional primary grade Spanish/English bilingual program including materials and procedures, train para-professionals to perform instructional activities within the bilingual classroom, give in-service training to professional staff, and allow non English-speaking parents to involve themselves comfortably in the educational enterprise.

The primary objectives of the Project are to:

1. Develop a functional primary grade Spanish/English bilingual program which will: a) improve the self image of non English-speaking children, b) enhance interpersonal relationships among children through coordinant activities of cultural variants, and c) develop communication proficiency among primary grade children in both Spanish and English.

2. Construct the bilingual program to include instructional activities which can be assumed by bilingual para-professionals trained in a specialized work/study program.

3. Provide an extensive in-service program for professional staff in how to effectively use para-professionals and bilingual program materials to promote awareness, confidence, and social interaction among students with different cultural orientations.

4. Use the school project as a vehicle whereby: a) non English-speaking parents may involve themselves comfortably in the educational enterprise, b) cross cultural communication and understanding may be stimulated between culturally different parents of school children, c) socio-economic relationships may be improved in the community.

The components of the Project include:

1. The designation as a learning laboratory of six public school first grade classes of randomly assigned, culturally different children wherein: a) bilingual instructional techniques will be developed, b) new materials will be tried and tested, c) para-professionals will receive supervised field work experiences, and d) professional staff experiential in-service training will be conducted.

2. The institution of higher education in the community will: a) inaugurate a cooperative training program for 20 paraprofessionals as bilingual program instructional technicians, and b) offer professional teacher supplementary training in bilingual program instruction.

3. Parent-community involvement activities to: a) advise in program construction, b) contribute local adaptations to materials development, c) assume program information dissemination responsibility, and d) provide leadership in coordinating school-community bicultural activities.

The percentage of Spanish-speaking children from an enrollment of 4300 pupils in the Artesia Public Schools is 36.5%. There is 33% of the total school population from low income families. The target group will be from the first grade classrooms in buildings where there is a high concentration of Spanish-speaking youngsters. Roselawn Elementary School, with a total enrollment of 209, will have about 40 pupils in the program the first year. Spanish-speaking pupils in Roselawn make up about 90% of the school population. Yucca Elementary School will have about 40 pupils in the program from a total enrollment of 353. Spanish-speaking youngsters make up about 60% of the school population. Central Elementary School, with a total enrollment of 350, will also have about 40 pupils in the program. Spanish-speaking youngsters make up about 30% of the total school population at Central Elementary.

The bilingual program participants will be selected from the schools mentioned above with both Spanish-speaking and English-speaking backgrounds. The projected numbers include a majority with Spanish as the mother tongue.

A Sustained Primary Program for Bilingual Students
At Las Cruces School District No. 2,
Las Cruces, New Mexico

The Sustained Primary Program for Bilingual Students is an experimental project designed to increase the achievement level of Spanish-speaking students in kindergarten through the third grade. The project is funded under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965. Initiated during the summer of 1967, the project is located in four elementary schools in Las Cruces School District No. 2. The three year project will be terminated in August 1970, but research results will not be completed until 1971.

The experimental design includes two experimental groups and one control group to provide definitive data for analyzing intellectual gains, academic achievement, and pupil adjustment. Measures of parent participation and attitude toward education will be tested for correlation with pupil progress. The experimental Title VII classes in two schools receive dual language instruction in both English and Spanish. The experimental classes, funded under Title III, in two schools are instructed in English only, using linguistic patterning techniques to teach English as a second language. The control group schools follow traditional instructional models characteristic of the Las Cruces School District.

Significant innovative components of the project included in the experimental classes are: (1) a four year non-graded curriculum, (2) parent-school involvement activities, (3) instructional teacher aides, (4) a 200 day school calendar, (5) pupil-teacher advancement, (6) an intensive staff in-service study program, as well as, (7) the language variations used in instruction.

The curriculum design stresses situations and materials wherein conceptual growth and positive self-esteem are achieved simultaneously. Cultural values in a historical setting are woven into an exploratory-discovery framework of teaching strategy.

Implementation of untried ideas for cultivating, increasing, and recognizing the value of parent involvement in pupil-learning experiences are used to improve parent participation and cooperation. Such involvement is intended to fortify the entire educational process and make learning a community-school-family responsibility.

The 200 day school calendar spread evenly over a twelve month period and practice of advancing teachers with pupils from year to year are organized to offer a sustained learning program for the students. The bilingual teacher aides provide teachers further opportunity to individualize the instructional program.

During the first year, the project was implemented in the kindergarten and first grades for 240 students. One grade has been added to the program in each subsequent year through the third grade. The four project schools and control group schools are located in areas having large concentrations of Spanish-speaking families who are economically deprived. Even though the economic factors are considered in the research design, they are not used as criteria in the selection of the students in the project. The only standards for students being included in the program are English language deficiency, parental consent, minimum family mobility history, and student ability in excess of minus one standard deviation from the mean project population.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program

Tucson School District

Reported by Miss Mercedes Guerrero
and Mr. Edward L. Madrid

The bilingual-bicultural program sponsored by Tucson School District No. 1 is partly financed by Title VII of the ESEA of 1965. It is the first experimental, truly bilingual, program in Tucson. At present, there are approximately 350 children participating in the bilingual-bicultural program. The two schools participating, Mission View and Drachman, are located in predominantly Mexican-American neighborhoods.

The major purposes of the bilingual-bicultural program are: (1) The development of the language processes in both Spanish and English, (2) The development of the two cultures--the Mexican and American, (3) The improvement of cognitive functioning, (4) The development of a positive self concept, the desire for academic achievement, and (5) The involvement of mothers and children.

The program includes two components--three-to-five year old preschoolers and first grade students. The procedure for the preschool component includes the mothers as the prime educators of their children. Since mothers are the children's first teachers and are with him most of the time in the early years, why not ask them to teach something very specific each day? In this way, we felt it might help mothers become better teachers and also help them understand the importance of play and play materials in the early learning of their children. This interaction might build some rapport between the home and the school. These speculations led to the Home Tasks Scheme, an extracurricular, educational, intervention scheme.

One day a week the mother comes to school with the young child. The teacher and the teacher aide help the mother with materials and techniques she could use with her child. The teacher explains the weekly Home Task; it may be a book, a toy, a game, or a puzzle. The teacher discusses with the mother what the task is intended to do, she demonstrates its possibilities and encourages the parent to use it with the child at least once a day. The mother then works/teaches with the child at home.

The next week, the mother returns to school for her weekly, two hour lesson and reports the results of the Home Task to either the teacher or the teacher aide. The results are recorded on IBM cards and are filed away for future reference. The mother listens to the teacher explain what the next task will consist of and picks up the new task with its instructions in both English and Spanish.

Once a week the preschool personnel--two teachers, two teacher aides, two community aides, an assistant research assistant, and the

coordinator--get together as part of their in-service training to plan and share experiences and materials. Here they work on the following week's Home Task.

The teacher aides provide a lot of individualized attention to all the children. Each of the eight teachers has a bilingual teacher aide. The community aide's most important function is to deliver the Home Task whenever a child and mother are absent for any reason.

The Bilingual-Bicultural Program
Phoenix Union High School, Phoenix, Arizona

Reported by Maria Luisa Vega

I will start by giving you an introduction of the beginning of the project. When permission was granted from the school administration to petition for federal funds, the idea of a Bilingual Program was presented to the community in the following ways:

1. Each Mexican-American organization in the city was contacted and the program was explained to them. Their support and participation was asked.
2. The Neighborhood Councils of the "inner city" were contacted and the participation of parents was asked in order to create in their minds that the program belonged to them.
3. Door to door contact in the homes was made in order to create interest in the parents and students of the merits of the program.

Community leaders, the parents, the students, teachers, teacher aides were asked to participate in the Summer Workshop in which a curriculum would be developed, materials would be discussed and organization would be planned for the program. All the members of the staff, five teachers, five teacher aides, a counselor and a secretary are bilingual. Teaching in small groups and individualized attention has been provided.

Our target group was 100 students from the "feeder" elementary schools. The criteria for those participating in the program was expressing a desire to be in the program by the student, parental consent, and having registered for a class in Spanish for the Spanish Speaking in the spring registration for their Freshman year. Priority was given to the students who attended elementary schools in Mexico and whom we felt would benefit from bilingual instruction.

In order to cope with the special needs of the group of students to be in the program, five subjects were initiated to the project. English as a Second Language, Reading, Spanish, Social Studies (with emphasis in Spanish History, Spanish Exploration of the New World, Pre-Columbian History of the Major Indian Tribes of Mexico, Central and South America, Southwest History will be included), and Mathematics. These five subjects are being taught in both Spanish and English and correlated with each other in order to facilitate the process of learning in our students.

Activities play a very important role in maintaining the interest and motivation of the students. Some of the activities include formation of clubs such as sports, careers, and cultural groups in which the folklore customs and traditions of both cultures are emphasized. Participation in school activities play an important role in instilling school spirit and help strengthen the integrity of the program. Student Governmental participation has developed a sense of responsibility and has given them

an opportunity to be acquainted with and practice the democratic process. Another important activity in the program has been field trips. These excursions are planned and discussed in each of the subject matter areas. Prior and after the trip exercises are developed so that a meaningful experience is instilled in the participants.

Evaluation of the program has been under an internal system and an external educational auditing agency. Two controlled groups with similar characteristics are being used to evaluate the program. One group is in the same school and another is in a school where hopefully the program will be initiated next year. Achievement tests in the five disciplines, a student attitude and inventory scale were administered at the beginning of the school year and will be administered again at the end of the first year to determine the validity of the program. If positive correlation is found the program will be expanded so that eventually 1000 students will be involved in three sister schools in the city.

NOGALES ELEMENTARY BILINGUAL PROJECT

Reported by Marie Rochford

Nogales, Arizona, is situated on the Mexican border alongside its twin city, Nogales, Sonora. The area is generally referred to as Ambos Nogales, due to the fact that in reality it is one city with only a fence dividing the two countries. The population of Nogales, Sonora, is approximately 50,000, and that of Nogales, Arizona, is 8,400. Of the 8,400 residents of Nogales, Arizona, 85% are Mexican-Americans.

The project program is being conducted at Elm Street School, which is in the lowest socio-economic section of Nogales. For the first year, there are three first grades involved with a combined total of 90 children. Next year, three new first grades will be added, and three more the following year. Children of comparable ethnic and socio-economic backgrounds from the other two elementary schools were selected as the control group. Both project and control groups were pre-tested in September, and will be post-tested by April.

The Project Director, Hamon Watson, is principal of Elm Street School, which has 15 classes, grades one through six. The three bilingual teachers are Lucy Carrasco, Marty Cortez, and Marie Rochford. Other Project personnel includes three bilingual aides, a full-time home-school coordinator, and a part-time internal evaluator. Dr. Herb Wilson, Professor of Education at the University of Arizona, has been invaluable as consultant to the program as well as director of the pre-service and in-service program.

The pre-service program consisted of two weeks of orientation for the Project personnel as well as interested teachers from the parochial school and the other public schools of Nogales. The in-service program consisted of a three hour weekly class in which Project personnel and other interested educators met to discuss the problems confronting the pilot program.

The Project Director fulfills his responsibilities as principal, and provides the Project personnel with guidance and information and the very necessary encouragement. The teachers plan the weekly activities together, then divide the work load of making materials, recording tapes, typing, dittoing, translating and adapting district materials, etc. The aides carry out instructional activities affording the children more individualized attention. The home school coordinator informs the parents of the progress of the program through home visitations, telephone calls, letters, and Advisory Council meetings. She informs the Project personnel of individual problems and suggestions made by the parents. She also conducts an oral English class for those parents of the Project children who wish to participate.

The first grade children entering the school were grouped by age. The children remain with their assigned teacher and aide all morning,

working in groups of six. Each teacher has five groups. In the afternoon the children are re-grouped, according to ability for instruction in writing, which is at this time correlated with Spanish phonetic skill development. For the first year, the language of instruction is Spanish, and the child's oral English is being developed. It is planned that the children and teachers remain together for three years, by the end of which time the major portion of instruction will be in English reading and vocabulary development.

Of the 90 Project children, 89 are Mexican-American and one is Anglo. Of the 89, five are truly bilingual and feel comfortable, and can function in either language. These five bilingual children and the one Anglo child are receiving instruction in English and oral Spanish language development.

The instruction center is L-shaped and divide into three areas. Each of the areas is further divided into five activity centers. In the morning, each child takes part in three learning activities. The next morning he moves to three others, so that each week the child is involved in 15 different learning activities. In each of the rooms, there are two supervised activities and three unsupervised activities. Included in the supervised activities are math instruction, oral English language development, social studies units (the Home, School, Community, etc.), awareness of good health and social habits, etc. The unsupervised activities consist mainly of listening to tapes (which reinforce those concepts introduced in the supervised centers), experimentation with varied art media, viewing 8mm films, construction, and instructional games. Many times the "unsupervised" activities are augmented by sixth grade students who are very eager to help. Parents also volunteer their time and energies. Not only do mothers spend time supervising their children in the classroom, but two fathers spend three hours a week as instructional aides.

The Nogales School Board, Administration, and Faculty have welcomed the Bilingual Program. The Board approved the removal of two walls between the three original classrooms to give us the L-shaped instructional center. It is expected that the same will be done for the three new first grades entering in September.

The Community has also reacted positively to Bilingual Education. The parents of the children who are involved are happy that we are teaching their children in their native language. We believe that a large majority of informed Nogalians are willing to accept the Bilingual Program as a possible solution to the long-standing dilemma of the non-English speaking Mexican-American student.

REACTIONS TO PRESENTATIONS
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

In discussion of Dr. Ulibarri's speech, it was felt that awareness of the various stages of acculturation was a major factor. It was felt that making children comfortable and accepted was of primary significance and one of the main objectives of a bilingual education program should be aimed at the development of a positive self-image in the child. Suggestions were made to further these ideas toward a more positive image and acceptance of children on all levels rather than rejection of children or people on any level.

The participants were concerned with community and parent participation in bilingual education. Several methods and ideas were discussed which could be utilized to strengthen the relationship between the school and the community. Such techniques as parent-teacher conferences, home tasks, utilization of counselors, home visitations, special school programs in bilingual education for parents, and other such suggestions were discussed. Teacher attitude and sensitivity toward keeping the channels of communication open to sell the bilingual program to the community were of prime importance.

It was felt that a well designed evaluation procedure was of utmost importance to improve a flexible program, including internal and external evaluation processes in all phases of the project to involve assessment of program management, project operations, and pupil assessment. Guidelines for a well defined curriculum were most urgently needed so that a minimum amount of time would be wasted by teachers as well as administrators in finding a direction.

Teachers are experiencing a great deal of frustration because materials are limited in the areas of bilingual education. However, teachers should accept and value the fact that they are in a better position to utilize the culture, customs, traditions and language of the community as basic information for the instructional program than any program developed by a publisher apart from the educational scene. Administrators and teachers need to be supportive of in-service time and money that encourages the preparation of materials appropriate to the culture, the community and the educational needs of the students involved. Education problems must meet special needs of children from : (1) border towns, (2) immigrant children, (3) migrant transit children and (4) Spanish speaking children from established communities. This group had a word of caution: teachers must be supportive of innovative approaches to bilingual education. Insistence upon sequential programs and developmental levels viewed in the traditional setting are apt to kill the bilingual instructional program before it has gotten off the ground. Another group felt that care should be taken to avoid middle-class WASP orientated materials. Also discussed was the fact that there would be different fluency in the language, English as well as Spanish, in different areas and bilingual teachers should be prepared for this situation

and keep their materials in line with the degree of adeptness in the language. Stressed also was keeping the materials interesting and creative.

There was a discussion on what to say when people asked what were their objections to adopting Anglo culture patterns. Some thought that when the Polish, Dutch, Greeks, and etc. immigrated to this country, they chose to abandon their culture and adapt the Anglo culture patterns. They made their own choice. Because of physical characteristics or historical background, the Spanish-Speaking people did not choose to do so. They felt that being able to function in a majority group was important but they should be allowed to keep their own language and culture. To the question asked "Are we trying to make our children change or conform to middle class standards?" - One conclusion was that the children were given a choice. A point brought out was the feasibility of giving the Spanish-American child instructions on heritage if parents had abandoned it. This group felt that the Mexican-American heritage was not being abandoned in the home. They also discussed parent involvement as a way of incorporating these values in the child. They felt that pre-service programs should include a section for parents.

It was thought by some that we should not speak of bicultural as if we were talking of two completely different cultures. They thought this would tend to confuse the student as well as the teacher. They might always be looking for a difference that might not be noticeable at all, or even be non-existant. The culture that all teachers should be aware of is the "home culture" of the Mexican-American; religious traditions, family unit, practices, foods, etc.

The problems of helping teachers become more proficient in using Spanish in academic instruction - writing, reading, and speaking in technical terms was discussed. They felt that the solution might be workshops and on-going inservice in Spanish language proficiency. Project personnel could plan these experiences in the light of their own needs.

Regarding the matter of better public relations to improve the image of teachers, F.T.A.'s should be encouraged to get involved in bilingual education. They felt that teachers were not properly prepared and that sensitivity and bilingual education courses should be required for all future teachers. High school and university students should be encouraged to work in the field of bilingual education and state funds provided for people interested in attending college who feel enthusiastic toward the programs but are financially unable to attend college.

It was felt that administrators (principals) should be more active in the classroom and be able, preferably, to speak Spanish. The role of the principal who will have a bilingual program in his school should take the responsibility of seeing that all teachers in the school understand the program, the special needs, the special materials, etc., so that there would be no unhealthy misunderstanding within the staff. A coordinator of the program should help the principal as he often cannot carry the additional responsibility of special programs. The principal can be very

effective in interpreting the program to the community. Principals should be alert to the spin-offs from the special programs which could help the traditional teachers not directly involved in the bilingual project. The problem of teacher acceptance would possibly be solved by greater participation and contributions. Perhaps appointing representatives from all grade levels not directly involved as well as teachers involved in the program.

Concern was expressed regarding teaching subject matter in Spanish. When funds are no longer available, what has this done to the child who must return to a monolingual program? Plan for continuity, set priorities, keep the long-range alternatives in mind. As regards to federal funding, it was agreed that yearly funding was bad. The children need a secured program; and, of utmost importance, to attract and keep quality teachers, they should be assured a secure position. They expressed a feeling of shame that it took Title VII to get the bilingual program started. To keep these programs going, it was felt that they should all take the responsibility of selling the program ... to the local district, the state, the federal government, the parent, the voter, and sell to the teacher who refuses to accept that there is a problem. The Arizona door-to-door and city social group visitations were applauded. Teachers should take a positive attitude in teaching bilingually; it was their opportunity to humanize the classroom, stressing affection and understanding.

In discussing blocks of English instruction vs. translation of every sentence, some felt that if a child was more comfortable in Spanish, they should use Spanish. There was concern expressed that the children could not speak either English or Spanish independently. Concurrent teaching was discussed as a new concept. Concurrent teaching in bilingual classes utilizes both languages as a concept and is sequentially developed thus avoiding literal translation and boring linguistic repetition. Parallel teaching implies immediate literal translation and may be repetitious. Concurrent teaching is on-going, expanding the concept in first one language and then the other. There was no general agreement as to the best way of integrating Spanish and English into their teaching process. Some thought that Spanish should be used as needed and the need would vary with each child. As to the problem of what is being done to improve the mother tongue, it was felt that consideration should be taken as to the area. In norther New Mexico, there is a stronger need for correctional Spanish than in the south. Some projects offer in-service training for aids in Spanish.

Emphasis upon interpersonal relationship and community skills should be given prime consideration. It is not enough to accept the statement that the purpose of the bilingual program is to help all children develop feelings of positive self-worth; teachers, aides, and parents need specific assistance and special training to understand and appreciate the child management techniques that can be used in the home and the schools to effectively develop the child's positive, self concept.

EVALUATION OF CONFERENCES

San Antonio, Texas, Conference

The San Antonio Conference was the result of long planning. The first planning meeting was between the director of the project and the Texas Associate Commissioner of International and Bilingual Education. At that time, it was agreed that the conference should have as its main focus the dissemination, discussion and sharing ideas on the following topics:

a. The relationship of bilingualism to the socioculture of the child.

b. Program development, methods and materials.

c. Administration of bilingual education with emphasis on its relation to the regular program.

d. Teaching personnel - qualifications, inservice education, and effective use of paraprofessionals.

e. Public relations with special attention to legitimization with parents and community.

The general procedure was to be the fairly traditional approach of (a) presentation on some aspect of the topic, (b) small group discussion of topic and (c) presentation of small groups' reactions to the topic at hand. It was agreed that groups under ten were the desired size.

The details of the conference were carefully executed by the State Director of Bilingual Education. He made arrangements for conference headquarters, lodging for participants, and the totality of the program from developing the final format to securing of speakers and the division of participants into small groups. The tenor of the entire conference was one of vibrant enthusiasm. The schedule was very heavy but the participants took it in their stride, working hard for the day and a half of the conference. A vast majority, for example, spent a good twelve hours on conference business on Friday, with time off only for lunch and dinner.

The only adverse criticism of the conference was the fact that there were too many speakers. Added to that was the scheduling of the presentations. The conference was divided into three main periods, Friday morning, Friday afternoon, and Saturday morning. In each one of these periods, there were more than one speaker presenting diverse topics. For example, Dr. Ulibarri presented "Socioculture and Bilingualism" followed immediately by Mr. Cantú's "Community Involvement Through Effective Use of Mass Media Communication." While the topics all related to the Bilingual education program, they were not directly related to each other. The result was that when the small groups met for discussion after the

presentations, one topic was discussed and the second was forgotten or received token attention. In this manner, the speaker who tuned in better to the interest of the group received more attention in the discussion and the other was tuned out regardless of the merit of the presentation.

Los Angeles Conference (Monte Corona)*

This conference was held after completion of the interpretive study phase of the project. Published material which had been developed during this earlier phase, was to provide the foundation for the discussion of bilingual education. Bilingual Education: A Handbook for Educators by Horacio Ulibarri, was delivered to participants before the beginning of the conference to guarantee that all participants had a prior knowledge of the findings of the interpretive studies.

The stated objectives of the conference were to disseminate information concerning:

1. Socioculture and bilingualism
2. Public relations and bilingual programs
3. Evaluation of programs
4. Program development
5. Teacher - paraprofessional relationships
6. Administration of bilingual education

The document, Bilingual Education, contained an extensive annotated bibliography of research related to bilingual education as well as a major handbook section which was an explicit assertion of the author's opinions concerning many phases of bilingual education programs. Again, this document was to provide the information base from which the two days of discussion were to proceed.

Conference Setting and Activities

Monte Corona is a superbly designed and equipped facility in which to achieve the objectives mentioned above. Its isolation in the quiet

*This evaluation was made by Dr. Richard Holemon, Chairman of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of New Mexico. He attended the conference as a participant observer. The following evaluation is, therefore, based upon direct observations of all phases of the conference. He did not take an active part in any conference activity although he attended all general sessions and many small group discussions, and he engaged in a number of informal conversations with participants concerning the conference objectives.

mountains assures an opportunity for concentration upon the subject of any conference. Its well equipped auditorium and small group areas provide the conference director with physical arrangements which directly enhance the conference objectives.

The activities of the conference alternated between formal presentations to the entire group and subsequent "small" group discussions of the formal presentations. During the two days the conference was in formal session for approximately twelve hours. During this time, six major addresses or presentations were made to the entire group assembled in the auditorium. The remainder of the formal conference time was devoted to group discussions, reports of group discussions, coffee breaks, and the like.

Persons were usually assigned to discussion groups according to the role they performed in their presently-funded bilingual education project. This procedure meant that in most cases project directors talked with each other as also did persons performing in other project roles.

The content of the formal presentations varied. Most presentors, however, revealed in their presentations little or no awareness of the material developed through the interpretive study and published in Bilingual Education. Indeed, the topics of their presentations did not suggest an intent to direct attention to this conference knowledges base. Such topics as "Bilingual Education in the State of California, 'A Trojan Horse,'" hardly suggested attempts to generate new knowledge or to validate present assumptions. Rather, they suggest a sort of political exhortation which may obtain appropriate bureaucratic responses by local bilingual project personnel.

The one address which did focus upon the knowledge base dealt with the topic of "Socioculture and Bilingualism." Group discussions which immediately followed this presentation were generally focused upon the adequacy of our knowledge of the socioculture of the bilingual child.

In addition to the formal session provision was made for entertainment after the dinner on Saturday evening. A number of talented entertainers because of their performance helped encourage a freer and more jovial atmosphere for that evening.

The final presentation to the conference was entitled "Recapitulation of Symposium Activities and Evaluation." This speech, which did not include major references to the conference objectives or activities, dealt with the presentors opinions about such contemporary educational issues as flexible scheduling, teacher aides, and public relations and a discussion of the Saber Toothed Curriculum.

Objective Attainment - There was little evidence to indicate that the participants utilized the knowledge base during the formal sessions of the conference. It is possible that the participants will become familiar with the results of the Interpretive Studies. If they do, that

learning will be a result of the compelling nature of the written material rather than the discussions at the Monte Corona Conference.

What was achieved at the Conference? From the point of view of state level administrators of bilingual education programs, certainly some important outcome were achieved. At little or no expense to the state department of education, key persons in federally funded bilingual education programs were brought to one central location to receive direction from state level administrators. The local project personnel became more fully aware of the expectations of state officials for the directions to be taken by federally funded programs. It will be left for others to decide whether these directions are consistent with Federal Legislative intent.

Throughout the discussions by state officials the matter of project continuation was a recurrent theme. By the end of the conference, only the most insensitive was unaware that implicit evaluation criteria were being expressed, and only they were unaware that these criteria would be subsequently applied to their projects when the matter of project continuation was considered.

From the point of view of local project personnel other things were achieved. They became acquainted in many cases for the first time with other persons engaged in bilingual education. It is not unreasonable to assume that many enduring and productive informal contacts will result. Also, these persons whose fate is apparently so closely linked to evaluation by state officials now have a clearer understanding of those criteria being applied to the focal project and local personnel.

Finally, what was the outcome of the conference from the point of view of the unseen participant--the bilingual child? If greater bureaucratic uniformity results with an attendent loss of local creativity in implementating bilingual education programs, then the child has been penalized because of this conference. On the other hand, if local project personnel did indeed gain more information about bilingual education and if they are not stifled in their application of this new knowledge by bureaucratic restrictions, then the unseen participant will have benefitted from the Monte Corona Bilingual Education Symposium.

Albuquerque Conference

The Albuquerque conference was the least structured of the three. The structure was obtained by careful assignment of participants into the several small groups. The basic design was to have each Project represented in each small group by one or more participants from the respective Project. After three sessions of this type, each Project was to meet with its entire delegation for a summing up discussion.

The general areas of discussion were (a) the relation of the socioculture to bilingualism and bilingual education, (b) program development, methods and materials, and (3) problems, issues, and solutions in bilingual education.

The first small group session had a double purpose. One was to start a dialogue on bilingualism-biculturism and their relation to the students' background. The second purpose was to allow the participants to know each other on a personal basis. After the presentation by Dr. Ulibarri, the groups went to their respective discussion areas. Judging from the leaders' presentation of the groups' discussions, the first objective was fairly well attained. Also, from observations on the comraderie exhibited throughout the conference, the second objective was also very well attained.

The second session, which was titled "Program Development," was kicked off by a ten minute presentation of each project's program. The idea was that with this type of presentation, there would be a fertile ground established for discussion and sharing of ideas on program development. As it turned out, the presentations were not all an account of thrust and goals of the Project, the program and its evaluation and problems encountered. Some were a public relations job that one would present to an unsophisticated public. However, this deficit was compensated by the fact that there were one or more representatives from each project that gave a more accurate picture of their respective projects. As was hoped, each group went into different directions in their discussions. Some covered much ground with minimal depth; others went deeper into smaller areas. All in all there was much sharing of ideas regarding thrust of programs, materials, and methodology. In this session, as well as in the first one, many references were made to the monograph Bilingualism: A Handbook for Educators. (This was not the case in the two previous conferences. Although mentioned, it never became a center for discussion. This may partly be due to the fact that not all the participants had read the monograph before coming to the conference in the case of the San Antonio and the California Conference. There were problems with the mail due to the Christmas rush.)

The third session was made up of three subsessions. The first subsession took place on Friday night. Here the participants were divided into small groups by categories: administrators, teachers, and teacher aides. The purpose of this subsession was to afford a platform for problem identification as each respective group perceived them. In this manner, teacher aides could not be intimidated by their teachers and the teachers would not be thwarted by administrators. At the same time, the administrators had mutual concerns peculiar to their area of operation and not directly related to the other two areas of function. There was much adverse criticism by the participants about this particular subsession, partly because of the time element - 7:30 to 8:30 P.M. Friday. Nonetheless, the purposes of the subsession seemed to be very well accomplished. The participants in each group became very aware of the problems they were facing by giving vent to their gripes without being inhibited by superiors or thwarted by the presence of subordinates.

The second subsession was entitled "problem identification and proposed solutions." Here the groups were divided into the same small groups of sessions One and Two, where all projects were represented by

one or more members in each small group. The purpose of this session was to identify problems and prepare solutions on a general bases without the regionalism of individual projects. There was much lively discussion in each of the small groups.

The third subsession was for the purpose of allowing each individual project to take a look at itself in relation to the problems it was facing and to try to identify solutions to these problems. For this purpose, each project assembled its participants as a small group. Here each project identified its problems and searched for solutions within reach. Since each project had problems it did not want to share formally with other projects, a degree of privacy for each group was insured.

The over all evaluation of this conference was a reassuring success. One criticism was that in a loosely structured conference the traditionalism of teachers interferes with the process. Teachers are use to more structure in conferences and when the structure is not readily visible, they feel uncomfortable. In this conference which was highly structured through group dynamics, and where teachers were given the structure ahead of the sessions, they felt ill at ease, to say the least, because the program <u>itself</u> was not structured

PRE- POST-QUESTIONNAIRE

The pre- and post-session Evaluation Questionnaires were designed to gain some idea about the areas of knowledge, interest, and activity of the participants, as well as possible changes in attitudes and benefits which might occur during the process of the conferences. In most cases, this analysis will be concerned with the percentage of responses for the Albuquerque and San Antonio Conferences Combined. However, when it is considered particularly relevant, each group will be considered individually. It was found that the number of questionnaires collected at the Monte Corona Conference was inadequate to be considered an accurate representation, and therefore has been eliminated from this analysis.

The first question was an open end question asking for a definition of "bilingual education." The responses were then classified in three different categories: A) teaching children in two languages, B) teaching children in two languages and understanding of two cultures, and C) for children to develop the ability to communicate in two languages. The combined rank order for both the pre- and post-questionnaire was A, B, and C. The greatest change from the pre- to the post- was on B, which changed from 21.64% to 29.45%. Although more people changed their attitudes toward including biculturalism in bilingual education, the majority of the people (pre = 60.73%; post = 63.16%) still considered bilingual education to be teaching the children in two languages. Communication may have generally been considered a bi-product of bilingual education rather than a definition per se. It is interesting to note that even though biculturalism made the largest change from pre- to post-, it still remained relatively low. It may be suggested that the change on B resulted from the emphasis it received in several portions of the conferences.

Question 2 was another open end question asking the participants to list what they consider to be the most important objectives of a bilingual education program. These responses were found to fall into five different categories: A) to educate bilingual children, B) to educate bilingual children in two languages, C) to increase the self concept of a child from a minority ethnic group, D) to teach the child to communicate in two languages, and E) to increase understanding and performance of children from minority ethnic groups.

On the pre-test, C received almost half the responses (48.12%), while the other four categories each received less than 16% of the responses. The categories, A, B, and E, all showed a slight increase from pre- to post-, while the other two categories reduced in relative frequency, though C still remained high with 46.63%. The largest change was on A, which increased from 12.80% to 18.61%. It seems strange that the majority of these people felt that the self concept of the child should be increased, yet only a small percentage considered native culture to be an important aspect of bilingual education or that understanding

and performance were important. It is difficult for this writer to see how success would not be considered more important to self concept than simply learning in two languages. We can only speculate that the respondents might have felt that learning in two languages would lead to success.

The competence and knowledge of people working in the field of bilingual education was considered generally good (pre = 51.57%; post = 44.88%), or fairly good (pre = 32.81%; post = 40.12%). It is interesting to note that after interacting with their peers for two days, their opinion of people's competence in bilingual education dropped.

On the pre-questionnaire, the participants were asked what percentage of their professional time would likely be devoted to bilingual education (Question 4). More participants responded to the "more than 80%" category (30.16%) than any other category, though the categories 11-25%, 26-50%, and 51-80% were close with 18.76%; 24.04%, and 21.62% respectively. Only 5.18% devoted less than 10% of their time to bilingual education. This would indicate that the conferences were successful in selecting a large portion of participants who were actively involved in bilingual education.

Thus far, there has been very little glaring disparity between the San Antonio and Albuquerque Conferences. However, question 5a on the pre-test (4a post-test) presents an entirely different picture. Of the San Antonio group, 51.78% (pre-) considered more than 41% of the children in the United States to be educationally handicapped by bilingualism, while the group in Albuquerque considered only 20.00% (pre-) of these children to be handicapped. The picture is even more drastic on the post-questionnaire with San Antonio responding 57.50%, while the Albuquerque percentage reduced to 16.66%. On the pre-test for Albuquerque, the highest category was 31-40% handicapped (28.88%), while on the post-test the highest category was from 21-30% (33.33%).

Question 5b (4b post-) asked the same question, only in relation to the Southwest. Both groups were quite similar with the high category being "more than 41%" in both cases (Albuquerque, pre = 69.23%, post = 58.33%; San Antonio, pre = 71.42%, post = 72.50%), with San Antonio remaining the most constant. However, it should be noted that only about half the participants responded to one of the five categories on either part a or b of this question. The other participants either didn't respond, or they noted on the questionnaire that they did not consider bilingualism to be a handicap. It would have been interesting to compare this latter group to their responses on questions 1 and 2 of the questionnaire.

The participants were asked to rate six portions of question 6 (Question 5 on the post-test) on a five point scale from "extremely important" to "of no importance" (a through e) as to the effect these problems have on hindering the development of bilingual education. These problems were: (6.1) "Lack of enthusiasm and general support among

educators;" (6.2) "Lack of enthusiasm and general support among public officials and politicians;" (6.3) "Lack of funds;" (6.4) "Lack of good research indicating what needs to be done;" (6.5) "Lack of well prepared teachers;" (6.6) "Lack of general knowledge of the problem." In all cases, the "extremely important" category received an overwhelming percentage of responses. The rank order of the categories was a through e for all problems listed.

Table I summarizes the results to question 7 on the pre-questionnaire. This table indicates the percentage of people keeping informed of other programs by the various methods listed. Since the participants could respond to more than one method, a relatively even distribution resulted.

TABLE I

Method of Keeping Informed of Other Programs Dealing with Bilingual Education (Percent of Responses)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
19.94	6.86	16.40	15.02	12.55	18.97	9.97	0.27

The responses to question 8 (Question 6 on the post-questionnaire) are summarized in Talbe II. By weighing each category according to the percentage of first, second, and third responses it received, category B (objectives for bilingual education programs) was considered the most important on both the pre- and post-questionnaire. The rank order for the next three positions was C, D, and A on the pre-test, while on the post-test, the order changed to A, D, and C for the second, third, and fourth position. As a general statement, it may be considered that the top four priorities for research, evaluation, and development are the nature of bilingualism, objectives of programs, development of curricula, and selection and preparation of staff (not in order). On both the pre- and post-questionnaire, the areas of administrative problems, community relations, evaluation, and research dissemination (not in order) were considered to be of considerably less importance.

Question 9 on the pre-test consisted of seven different parts. The participants were asked to rate the degree of benefit (from A = great, to E = not at all) they expected to receive from the conferences for themselves and their institution. On the post-questionnaire (Question 7), the participants were asked to rate the same statements (as 9 on the pre-) as to the degree of benefit they received. The percentages for Albuquerque, San Antonio, and the Combined groups, are summarized in Table III. Many rather large differences and changes may be observed between and within the groups. Only those categories changing ten or more percentage points will be discussed.

TABLE II

Areas Which Should Receive First, Second, or Third Priority
For Research, Evaluation, and Development
(Percent of Responses)

PRE-QUESTIONNAIRE								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
First	20.27	25.86	15.61	12.43	8.99	4.94	5.76	6.12
Second	8.32	19.96	23.82	19.47	4.46	9.87	7.42	7.03
Third	10.89	18.65	15.69	20.79	8.29	13.02	7.08	5.06
POST-QUESTIONNAIRE								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
First	25.46	22.00	18.12	9.57	6.91	5.49	3.25	9.17
Second	16.80	25.74	16.07	22.47	4.75	5.95	4.02	4.16
Third	10.67	17.62	16.45	19.42	6.79	12.66	7.26	8.87

The percentage of responses in the "great" category reduced from pre- to post- for both Albuquerque and San Antonio on 9.1 ("using the guidelines for developing new programs"). The "very little" category increased considerably for both groups, while the San Antonio group also changed in the "some" category. Apparently, both groups had high hopes of learning how to develop new programs at the beginning of the conferences, but those hopes were not fulfilled. A similar conclusion may be drawn for item 9.2 ("using the guidelines for revising current projects"), since San Antonio decreased on A (great) but increased on both C and D (some and very little respectively). Albuquerque decreased on B (considerable) with the increases distributed over the three "lowest" ranks. Had the conferences been designed primarily to provide guidelines to the participants, they most certainly would have failed.

Item 9.3 was "having a better knowledge of what others in the field are doing." The Albuquerque Conference may be considered to have been quite successful in this respect, while the San Antonio Conference should be considered only moderately so. The former group increased on A and decreased on B, while the latter group increased on B and decreased on A. It should be noted that the location, direction, and amount of changes within these two groups resulted in little or no change when the groups were combined. One of the primary purposes of these conferences was to provide an opportunity for people involved in bilingual education programs to interact with each other.

TABLE III

Percentage of Responses Indicating Degree of Expected Benefit (Pre-) and Degree of Perceived Benefit (Post-) from the Conferences

	Albuquerque		San Antonio		Combined	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
9.1 Using the guidelines for developing new programs						
A.	29.72*	11.11	23.74*	8.54	26.73*	9.82
B.	39.18	31.48	35.97	29.91	27.58	30.69
C.	22.97	27.77	22.30*	35.04	22.69	31.41
D.	2.70*	18.51	10.79*	21.23	6.75*	19.87
E.	5.40	11.11	7.19	5.98	6.30	8.54
9.2 Using the guidelines for revising current projects						
A.	31.16	25.92	35.21*	3.38	33.19*	14.65
B.	42.85*	27.77	36.61	33.05	39.73	30.41
C.	24.67	31.48	19.01*	41.52	21.84*	36.50
D.	1.29	11.11	4.92*	16.10	3.11*	13.60
E.	0.00	3.70	4.22	5.93	2.11	4.81
9.3 Having a better knowledge of what others in the field are doing						
A.	44.87*	71.15	67.76*	43.80	56.32	57.47
B.	42.30*	25.00	26.97*	38.84	34.64	41.92
C.	11.53	3.84	5.26	11.57	8.39	7.70
D.	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.13	0.00	2.07
E.	1.28	0.00	0.00	1.65	.64	.83
9.4 Establishing communication to keep informed of what others are doing						
A.	40.78*	55.55	44.02	36.97	42.40	46.26
B.	34.21	29.62	35.82	35.29	35.02	32.46
C.	22.36*	11.11	18.65	16.80	20.51	13.95
D.	0.00	3.70	.74	9.24	.37	6.46
E.	2.63	0.00	.74	1.68	1.69	.84
9.5 Finding out specific problems others have been having and possibly avoiding them						
A.	37.66*	51.91	47.05*	33.60	42.36	42.75
B.	42.85*	30.76	38.97	29.56	40.91*	30.16
C.	14.85	15.38	12.50*	23.77	13.39	19.57
D.	3.89	1.92	1.47	10.65	2.67	6.29
E.	1.29	0.00	0.00	2.45	.65	1.23
9.6 Gaining suggestions dealing with specific problems						
A.	44.15*	30.76	44.28*	17.79	44.22*	24.28
B.	32.46	32.69	41.42	33.89	36.94	33.29
C.	18.18	23.07	12.14*	27.96	15.16*	25.51
D.	3.89	9.61	2.14*	16.10	2.99	12.85
E.	1.29	3.84	0.00	4.23	.65	4.04
9.7 Gaining knowledge of research done in the area						
A.	37.66*	22.60	41.60*	14.78	39.63*	18.69
B.	44.15*	18.86	39.41	34.78	41.78*	26.82
C.	16.88	22.60	13.86*	26.08	15.37	24.34
D.	1.29*	22.60	3.64*	17.39	2.47*	19.99
E.	0.00*	13.20	1.45	6.95	.73	10.06

* = Change of 10% or more

A, great: B, considerable: C, some: D, very little: E, not at all

There were no formal channels provided in these conferences for people to "establish communication to keep informed of what others are doing" (Item 9.4). The only changes noted were in the Albuquerque group, which increased on A and decreased on C. The slight changes in the San Antonio group off-set the above changes so that when the groups were combined, there were little or no differences between the pre- and the post-questionnaire. It seems as though the Albuquerque participants were more prone to communicate on both an informal and a formal basis. This conclusion is further supported on item 9.5 ("finding out specific problems others have been having and possibly avoiding them"). The Albuquerque group increased on A and decreased on B, while the San Antonio group increased on C and decreased on A.

Item 7.6 was concerned with "gaining suggestions dealing with specific problems." Both groups decreased on A, while San Antonio increased on C and D. The within group changes resulted in a combined reduction on A and increase on C. It seems as though the communication that existed was more of a general "what are you doing" nature than the more specific type of "how are you doing it" and "what are your problems."

The last item on question 9 (9.7) was "gaining knowledge of research done in the area." Albuquerque decreased on both A and B, and increased on both D and E. The San Antonio group also decreased on A, but increased on C and D. Combined reductions may be noted on A and B, with an increase on D. It may safely be concluded that communication about research was lacking at both conferences. It should be noted that the San Antonio participants expected considerably more benefit from the conferences than they felt they received. This conclusion is supported by the reduction in A on every item for this group. If the participants' level of expected and perceived benefits may be considered an index of the success of these conferences, then the Albuquerque conference should be considered the more successful of the two.

The differences between the two groups on perceived benefits are further supported by their responses to questions 8 and 9 on the post-questionnaire. The Albuquerque participants considered themselves "decidedly more hopeful" and "decidedly more knowledgeable" about the future of bilingual education (52.00% and 50.00% respectively). More of the San Antonio group responded to the "decidedly" category (44.91%) than the "slightly" category (36.44%) on question 8, but the order was reversed on question 9 ("slightly" = 43.10%; "decidedly" = 34.48%). The other three categories of "about the same," "slightly less," and "decidedly less" all received a relatively low percentage of responses.

On question 10, the participants were asked to check any of the following areas where they felt they had gained information at the conferences: A) financial resources, B) teaching resources, C) research, D) techniques, E) needs, and F) problems. The Combined percentage of responses were F (27.33%), E (24.94%), B (18.89%), D (13.06%), C (9.58%), and A (6.16%). The rank order of these items were exactly the same for Albuquerque, San Antonio, and the Combined groups. It is doubtful that much confidence can be placed in the absolute value of the number of responses to these

items since they disagree to some extent with the above analysis of question 7 on the post-questionnaire (Number 9 on the pre-test).

The last question to be analyzed was number 13 on the post-questionnaire. It was divided into three parts to which the participants were asked to respond: A) not at all, B) somewhat, C) to a substantial extent, D) almost completely, or E) overwhelmingly. The first part asked if any aspects of the conference would help them "to devise usable, operational guidelines for bilingual education programs." The Combined response B received the highest percentage (43.69), followed by C (32.18%), A (13.37%), D (6.53%), and E (4.19%). Part two was concerned with helping the participants "to develop a regional awareness of human resources for studying bilingual education in the Southwest." The order of responses were C, B, D, E, and A, from most to least. The third part asked if the conferences were helpful in "establishing a communication network for researchers, project directors and decision makers involved with bilingual education programs." Most of the participants felt that the conferences were helpful in this regard "to a substantial extent" (36.47%), followed by B (30.25%), E (17.58%), D (9.26%), and A (6.43%). As a generalized summary, it may be stated that most of the participants considered the conferences to be reasonably helpful and/or beneficial, even if it may not have always been so in the areas they had anticipated.

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

This final report represents many hours of hard work on the part of many people. Even with all the advances in communication, accurate dissemination of information remains very much an art as the process of communication entails transmitting and receiving. Thus, the need for accurate transmission, and accurate reception and decoding, are very great. On a broad area such as bilingualism and bilingual education, this accuracy can not be guaranteed at any level.

In the first phase of the project, it was found that, while there was much literature on bilingualism, the research had been done with a shotgun approach, having no unbrella or direction in its thrust. Most of it was done because of the idiosyncratic interest of the individual researchers. Much of what passed for research did not stand simple tests of design, procedure, and analysis; therefore, much of it had to be discarded.

What was finally accepted had to be translated to application in the classroom. In the area of applied research in bilingual education, what was found was mostly of the survey type. Little pilot or experimental research was found. Thus, the translation of the research into classroom application was somewhat impressionistic and definitly hypothetical. To be sure, some very good ideas were contributed by many people. But, these ideas have to be tested in the daily routine of the bilingual classroom.

What major conclusion can be drawn from this study is that there is no major body of research knowledge that the bilingual educator can turn to for direction. In essence, every classroom involved in bilingual education is an experimental laboratory, and every bilingual teacher is an experimenter. While bilingual education has been around for a long time, in terms of wide application, it is still an infant in swaddling clothes. There is a lack of tried curricular approaches and methodology. There is a lack of materials and, worst of all, there is a dearth of trained personnel at all levels.

Were it not that the apparent advantages of bilingual education over traditional approaches, particularly for minority groups, are so great, probably the strongest recommendation coming from this study would have been to abandon the motion of bilingual education. At present, in a manner of speaking, the blind are leading the blind. Bilingual educators at the moment have more dedication than sophistication. In such state of the act, chaos can easily result. Thus, logically it would seem that a moratorium on bilingual education should be declared, until more accurate and applicable research knowledge is obtained.

However, the preliminary outcome in terms of student growth are so promising, that bilingual education is here to stay. Most bilingual educators feel that there is enough knowledge to get started, and through

trial and error bilingual education will grow and mature. The hazards involved in this approach are too apparent to comment on them. There is much need of more sophisticated research - based knowledge and systematic application of it to classroom use. Therefore, a recommendation in this report is that the Office of Education mobilize its forces to establish an "unbrella" program for research, application, and information dissemination on bilingual education. Not to do it is to allow bilingual education to grow into a formless monster. To keep funding for bilingual education in the present state of the act is very often to waste money in this effort.

Meantime, while the research is getting started, the educators in the field need to share their information and pool their resources. There is a serious lack of information sharing in bilingual education, even within states, let alone within the region or nationwide. Information on materials and techniques should be constantly shared. At present, this is not done because there is no vehicle with which to do it. It was only through the conferences sponsored by this project that large numbers of bilingual educators in the states of Texas, New Mexico, and California got together for the first time to discuss their problems and share their information. Therefore, the second and last recommendation is that a system for communication, through which the bilingual educators can discuss their problems and concerns, and share their information, be established. This information system should have state dimensions, as well as regional and national.